An Examination

of three

Prelatical Pamphlets,

Viz.

I. A Full and Final Anſwer &c.

II. Imparity among Paſtors, in ſo far, as it entrencheth upon the Remarks on the Caſe &c.

III. And the ſhort Character of the Presbyterian Spirit, in a Letter to a Friend:

Pſal. 31 Verſe 18.

Let the lying Lips be put to ſilence, which ſpeak grievous Things proudly, and contemptouſly againſt the Righteous.

Epiſcopi noverint ſe magis conſuetudine, quam diſpoſitionis Dominicæ Veritate, Presbyteris eſſe majores. Hieron in Ep. ad Titum.

EDINBURGH,

Printed by *GEORGE MOSMAN*, And are to be ſold at his Shop in the *Parliament-Cloſs*, M DCC. III.

Advertiſement.

The *Reply* frequently ſpoken of, and to which the Reader is ſometimes referred, is *Tolerations Fence Removed* &c.

The Full, and Final, *Answer* Examined.

IT is long since the most judicious of my Acquaintance reckoned that this Paper-conflict concerning *Toleration* was carried even as far as the matter doth require, and that it had degenerated into a mere Scolding on the part of those that plead for it, whereupon I was resolved to take no notice of the Pamphlets lately emitted, viz. *The full and final Answer &c.* The *Extempore Debate &c.* The *Short Character &c.* They containing nothing new, unless it be some stroaks of supercilious pride, some scoffing and bitter Expressions, and unjust Recriminations, and some contentious Wranglings concerning matters of Fact, which make nothing for them tho they were true, as many of them to my own certain knowledge are monstruously false; however to stop the mouth of the Adversary, and that they may not have the least pretence, I have surveyed these abovementioned sheets, and I presume that when you have a spare hour, ye will consider my observations on them.

I shall begin with *The full and final Answer*, for judgeing them according to their bulk and weight I could not refuse it the preference, and first of all I must observe that tho he is very careful to mark the page of the *Plain Dealing* all along, yet it seems he found it not for his interest many times to direct his Reader to the page and leaf of the Paper he pretends to Answer. [2] He vainly alledges I passed over his hardest Arguments, and I do declare I found none of his Arguments hard. and when I passed over any thing in his Paper, it was truely because I found it fully Answered before, or because I found it so palpably extraneous to the Debate, or trifling that the meanest capacity might observe it to be so I am not so unconcerned in the matter under Debate, as to let any thing pass that I supposed would do the least prejudice to the Cause, yea I will adventure to tell this Gentleman, I might have over-looked his whole Book, and gi-

ven him and it that ſhort diſpatch, *viz.* That it contained nothing new and to the purpoſe, but what has been Anſwered again and again, I ſaid ſome ſuch thing in the beginning of the Reply, and he takes notice of it *P.* 4. And firſt he tells me, he will make me ſenſible before he has done that there was ſomething new in his *Plain Dealing*, I confeſs if his *Dealing* had been *Plain*, it would have been ſomething new indeed, but it is found not to be ſo, for he hath ſerved us after the old manner ſtill, but doth he mean ſome new Argument, or old ones further improven, then I muſt ſay he is not ſo good as his word, but let him not think I reflect upon his honeſty, Men may be forced to fail of their promiſe, it not being in their power to perform, I only ſay he was raſh in promiſing, for in his whole Paper, there ſhall not be found any thing new and of weight which paſſed without a Reply. [2] He tells me if thoſe earlier Papers emitted by them had been Anſwered, *he might have received tolerable ſatisfaction*, and conſequently ſpared his pains, but ſays he, the Anſwers were mere jugle *&c.* Good Sir! you are not our judge, ye are too much a party for that office, the impartial and judicious Reader muſt examine the matter, and to him I freely appeal. [3] He falls heavy upon me, as immodeſt and unmannerly, for calling his Paper old and borrowed thoughts in a new dreſs, and yet in the next line he tells me, that the Author of the Letter might have ſaid of it, as the young Prophet of the Ax, 2 *Kings* 6. 5. *Alas* Maſter it was borrowed, but borrowed or not, it has galled this Gentleman and others of his ſtamp to that degree, that every one of them who has appeared in Print found himſelf under ſome Obligation to try his ſtrength, in wreſtling with it: Whereby it appears, that it lyes nearer their heart, than they are willing to own; and that they think, they are never able to do enough againſt it; and notwithſtanding of all their Efforts, I appeal to the impartial Reader if that Letter maintains not its ground, and triumphs in the field, however this Gentleman in his own experience may find how powerful the influence of Example is, and therefore conſidering how that his Brother, the Author of the *Caſe* pag. tells his Reader; now the Letter from a Gentleman *is fully Conſidered*, [which yet was not true] *the reſt of their Papers being the ſame Diſh ſerved up in different Sauces, they may be reckoned all Anſwered.* He ſhould not have quarrelled my Freedom, but perhaps the Author of the *Caſe* is a Man of eminent Degrees above Rules; and therefore it may be Arrogancy and the hight of Incivility in ordinary Men to uſe his Freedom. I muſt not forget how this modeſt and mannerly Man pag. 3. is pleaſed to tell the World, that the *Reply is ſtuff'd with diſingenuous Miſrepreſentations, impertinent Digreſſions, illogical Inferences, nauſeous Repetitions, confident Aſſertions, impudent Denyals* &c.

Here

Here you have a ſwatch of his Modeſty and good Manaers to return him his own Words, but I am better acquaint with him, than to be ſurpriſed herewith, or to find him really and reſolvedly doing that which he complains of, and condemns others for. it is eaſy magiſterially to condemn Perſons and Things, and I am of opinion that this Gentleman and thoſe of his Kidney will never manage their affairs to purpoſe, where they have not Authority in their hands deſpotically to condemn and Power and external Force to ſuppreſs us; the Dint of Argument will not do it, the Scriptures affords our Adverſary none of theſe, and our Conſciences are ſuch that nothing elſe will yeild us Conviction and Satisfaction. As for the hard Names and heavy Charge he advances againſt me, I ſhall make no other Reply, but that of the Apoſtles, *it is a ſmoll thing for mee to be judged of Mans Judgement*; my Record is on high, my Witneſs is in Heaven, my Teſtimony is in mine own boſom, and in the Conſciences of theſe that are acquainted with me, and with the matters of which I have diſcourſed and even in the Paper it ſelf, I have given authentick Evidences as to the matters of Fact, citeing the Acts of Parliament, and to this day none has raiſed the leaſt exception againſt them. As to the things I advance upon my own knowledge, I defy the world to reach me there, and as for ſome few Particulars I have by Report, (which are but few, and it matters not much to the Debate in hand, tho' they were daſhed out) I have all the Aſſurance of them that is required in ſuch Caſes: Our Author will have me an angry Man, yea a Man full of Malice againſt the Perſons and Principles of Prelatical Men, I do not in the leaſt regard this, it is a queſtion whither a Man would be the better or the worſe of his Teſtimony. As for Prelatical Principles, I do indeed hate them, as being inconſiſtent with the Scriptures, but as for the Perſons of thoſe of the Prelatical Perſwaſion, I love them, and I have a great honour for many of them, and they are not behind with me in Teſtimonies of Kindneſs and Reſpect, but it ſeems our Author meaſures other Men by himſelf, if he thinks Men cannot maintain their Cauſe one againſt another, even in Print, without being maliciouſly affected againſt the Perſons of one another.

Pag. 5. He is pleaſed to tell us the Remarks on the *Caſe &c.* are unworthy of the Authors regard or any Mans elſe; here is an illuſtrious Evidence of his Modeſty and good Manners. How happy would this Man be, if he had a Faculty to tranſubſtantiat matters into what he thinks fit to pronounce or call them, but matters ſtand as they are, let him call them as he will, nor will he I hope be look't upon, as the infallible judge of Controverſies, and therefore after all his confident Condemnatory Sentences againſt thoſe Papers, Men of Sence will never think the worſe of them,

whatever they may think of him, if when they have considered them they find Truth and Reason in them. And then he says pray Sir! *Who has the Knack of saying and unsaying*, he pretends I contradict my self, the matter is this; speaking of the Remarks on the Case and of the second Letter, I said this Man has not been at leasure to take any notice of what has been contain'd in these Papers. I said likeways, in that same page, that the *Plain-Dealer* had found what was contained in them, to be too strong for him, and that he had set his Thumb upon it, I am of opinion none will see a contraiction here, that has not our *Plain-Mans* Spectales. I never doubted but he read these Papers before he published his *Plain-Dealing*; and therefore I judged, that he found it for his purpose to carry as if he had not considered them, and to hide what is there advanced from his Reader, as if he had set his Thumb upon it.

Page 6. He pretends in the two last Leaves of the Gentlemans Letter, it is stuffed with malicious and mischievous Stories against *Prelatists*, It's good this Gentleman has learned the Knack of speaking in general Terms, it seems he durst not adventure upon *Particulars*, and I am very sure there is not any one Story there, but the Nation is aboundantly convinced of the Truth of it, nor was it out of any malicious Design, that these horrible Cruelties *Presbyterians* underwent in time of Prelacy were there represented, but merely to refresh the Memories of the Honourable Members of Parliament seasonably to prevent the Church, and Nations falling under these Confusions and Blood-sheds under which we had so long groaned.

Page. 7. He talks of *Toleration* in the Days of *King James* and of the *Indulgence* by *King Charles* 2. but enough of these already, only I cannot but wonder how his Conscience can allow him to say that *Presbyterian* Ministers in the time of *King James* his *Toleration* spoke not one word against the Errors of *Rome*, or of the danger of their spreading and prevailing in the Land, had he but consulted his worthy Brother the Author of *Toleration Defended*, he would have told him that *Dr. Hardie* a Presbyterian Minister did then *Preach* against *Popery*, and he was likeways told that Mr. *Orrock* suffered upon the same Score, but it is all one to our Author, what is true or what is false, what is said or what is not said: what is consistent with his own Knowledge and Conscience, and the Knowledge and Conscience of the whole Nation, or not: And it should be all one to me what he affirms or what he denys, and to all Men, seeing when he has a Story to tell, it is manifest he is only concerned to know whither it may blacken his Adversary and prejudge unthinking Men against the established Church, and then without any more adoe he advenceth it, tho' never so false, but let him speak or write what he will, many thousands can witness *Presbyterian* Ministers freely and faithfully *Preached* and *Prayed* against *Popery* in the Days of *King James*: I heartily wish God may awaken

waken the Conſcience, and grant this Man Repentance and Pardon, for this wilful and moſt unacountable Reproach.

Page 7. He alledges I prove nimble for him, and that I labour to turn his own Cannon againſt him, but pretends, I am not Maſter of his Artilery, and I pretend I am abſolute Maſter of it, let the impartial Reader judge between us: but becauſe the whole ſtreſs of the Debate between the Author and me lyes in what I am now to enter upon, and conſidering that he has intermingled it with ſeveral Particulars which do darken and divert: I ſhall endeavour to conſider them, in the firſt place. And firſt, he will have us *Schiſmaticks*, but this Charge againſt our Church is anſwered, and fairly layed at the door of other *Remarks* upon the *Caſe*, page 33, 34. And likeways in the 5, ,6 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 pages of the *Vindication* of Mr. *Meldrums* Sermon, this is ſo fully and convincingly ſpoke to that; the beſt Service I can do my Reader, is to refer him thither. (And in the mean time) I muſt crave leave to tell my Author; that ſeeing both theſe Papers were long publiſhed before the *full* and *final Anſwer*, if he had had it in his Heart to deal plainly, and not to impoſe upon the unwarry Reader: He would have returned ſome Anſwer to what is there ſaid, but it ſeems he found theſe Arguments too hard, and I do not expect ſo much *Plainneß* from him, as an open acknowledgment of the Truth in this, or any other Point, whatever ſecret Convictions he may have in his Conſcience, upon the reading of our Papers.

Page 8. He pretends that to condemn our Church, as not duely conſtitute, will not infer the Condemnation of Reformed Churches Abroad, and this in Contradiction to what I had ſaid page 8 of the *Reply* for, ſays he, there is a great Diſparity between this Church and the Reformed Abroad. *1ſt.* He ſays, they had great Reaſon to ſeparate from their *Biſhops* they being *Popiſh*, and cleaving to their Errors, and I ſay we had the ſame Reaſon to ſeparate from ours at the Reformation, when we did ſhake off the Yoak of Prelacy as well as Popery, and ſuch of the Popiſh *Biſhops* as renounced that Hereſie, renounced alſo their Prelatical Principles and Jurisdiction, and were admitted of our Church, and received as Presbyters only, which is plain in the Caſe of *Gordon* then *Biſhop* of *Galloway*, and others. And we ſtill plead for Presbytery as our Reformation Right, and a Branch of it. [2] He pretends the Reformed Churches Abroad ſadly Lament the want of *Biſhops* page 8, and heartily wiſh they were reſtored *Plain-Dealing* indeed, or plainly ſomething elſe which I am unwilling to name. [3.] he ſays they never rejected or condemned the Order of *Biſhops*. Now if it be evident, that the Reformed Churches have judicially aſſerted that Parity among Miniſters is of Divine Right,

and consequently that no *Bishop* or *Prelate* can pretend any Superiority over the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments, then it must be owned the Reformed Churches do not Lament the want nor desire the Restitution of *Bishops*, and that they really and in effect declared against Prelacy, as not of Divine Right, and as having no Countenance from, or Foundation in the Word of God; but it is plain they have done so from their Confessions of Faith, which are the most authentick Evidence that can be adduced, the French Confession Art. 30. asserts an Equality amongst Pastors, *Credimus omnes Pastores ubicunque collati sunt eadem & equali potestate inter se praditos, sub uno illo capite, summo & solo universali Episcopo Jesu Christo*; and no Minister nor Elder or Deacon was admitted in the French Church but signed this Confession. The Dutch Confession asserts the same thing, *Art.* 31. *Caterum ubicunque sunt locorum Verbi Dei Ministri eandem atque aequalem omnes habent tam potestatem tam authoritatem, qui sunt aque omnes Christi unici illius universalis Episcopi & capitis Ecclesiæ Ministri.* Now this Confession being read by the famous Synod of *Dort*, upon the desire of the *States* the *Bishop* of *Landaff* in the name of the English Deputies, openly protested against this Article in these Words. That whereas in the Confession of Faith, there was a strange conceit of the parity of Ministers instituted by Jesus Christ; he and his Brethren dissented from that Point, and as no less could be expected from them, so no dislike was shown to that Article, by the Deputies of other Churches, and therefore they were to be reckoned Assenters to it. Now after all this, to assert that the Reformed Churches Abroad Lament the want of *Bishops*, desire the Restitution of them, never declared against Prelacy is *Plain-Dealing* with a Witness, and to oppone the Letters of particular Men, as our Author doth page 9, contrary to the Confession of the Church of which they were Ministers and which they had signed, is to do them no small dishonour, yea it's plain *Le Moyn L'angle*, and the famous M. *Claude* was basely abused and miserably misinformed of the state of the Church of *England* when they wrote the Letters annexed to *Stillingfleet's* Book to the *Bishop* of *London*, as is fully acknowledged in the Letter M. *Claude* wrote to the Lady *R.* I shall give ye, his words fairly translated. First of all says M. *Claude* 'I protest to you 'upon my Conscience that when I wrote to my Lord *Bishop* of *London*, 'I had not the least Design that my Letter should be printed or 'made publick, yea I was greatly surprised, and even astonished when 'I saw it in English and French at the End of the Book which ye sent me toge-'ther with one from M: *Moye*, and another from M: L'Angle. Moreover 'madam I do assure you that when I wrote I had nothing before my eyes but 'these two things, to justify our selves from a calumny imputed to us by

some,

‹ ſome, viz, that we believed that no Perſons can be ſaved who live under ‹ Epiſcopal Government, and to contribute as much as my weakneſs was ‹ capable to a good and holy Reunion betwixt the two Parties, &c. and to to this Letter that of M. *Claude* to the Biſhop of *London* dated *Paris* April 16. 1681. doth referr. And its very plain by that Letter of M. *Claude*, to the Biſhop of *London* together with my Lady *R.* her Letter, that the Adverſaries thought it not ſufficient to oppreſs diſſenters at home, but were ſo cruel as to miſrepreſent them abroad as if forſooth the diſſenting Miniſters had Preached to the People, that there is no poſſibility of Salvation under Epiſcopacy, and that all thoſe ſhal be damned eternally, who hear Epiſcopal Miniſters, now I am of opinion our Author and his Friends are convinced as Dr. *Stillingfleet* was long ſince that it had been for their intereſt thoſe Letters ſo deceitfully Procured from thoſe three French Miniſters, had never been expoſed to public Veiw. And as for M: *Claude* it can be verified that in a Conference with a Scots Divine Repreſenting to him, that the Prelats here pretended the French Church were deſirous to have Prelats, he returned this anſwer. *Eſt putidiſſimum mendacium; nos abhorremus.* And upon the whole its clear, that to condemn our Church as not duely conſtitute, becauſe we have not Prelats, is to condemn the Reformed Churches abroad, and that the Diſcrepancies condeſcended on by our Author are falſe and imaginary to ſay no worſe of them; and now I return to the Argument as our Author layes it down p. 7. viz. (I affirmed *Plaindealing* p. 3. near the end) that to ſeparate from a duely conſtitute Church governed by lauful Canonical Biſhops and Presbyters. Where nothing unlaw ful is required as a condition of Communion with it is to be guilty of Schiſm, but ſuch was our Epiſcopal Church from which the Presbyterians factiouſly and furiouſly ſeparated therefor the Presbyterians in ſeparating from our Church were Schiſmaticks.

Altho' I am not fond of Prelats Canonically ordained, and gave ſuch ſolid Arguments why ſuch a clauſe ought not to be in the deſcription of a true Church tolerations fence remov'd p. 4. as our Author it ſeems had not courage enough to grapple with, yet no Man can blame me if I make uſe of Golias ſword to cut off Golia's head, and therfor I deny his minor, and in the firſt place I muſt tell this Gentleman he miſerably bewrayes his ignorance of the ancient Canons in affirming that the Scots Prelats were Canonical, and if this were neceſſary to make a Church duely conſtitute their Church can never be reckoned a Church duely conſtitute; for I ſhal undertake under the pain of Infamy to draw out a Sentence of depoſition againſt all the Biſhops that have been in Scotland from the ancient Canons, it ſeems our Author is not acquainted with the Ancient Canons, called the Apoſt-

les which were confirmed by a General Council at Conſtantinople, do not they depoſe all Biſhops that are choſen by the Civil Magiſtrate as Canon 29, if any Biſhop obtains a Church by means of the ſecular Powers let him be depoſed and ſeparated from Communion with all his Adherents, and this Canon is ratified and revived by the 2 Council of Nice, but all out Scotiſh Prelats were choſen by the Magiſtrate, and not by other Biſhops or the Presbyters and People of their Dioceſs, and therefor all of them ought to have been depoſed, and ſeparated from Communion with all their Adherents, ſo far were they from being Canonical as this plain Man confidently aſſerts, the Kings write of Conged' Eſlier to the Dean and Chapter to chooſe their Biſhop is only matter of form, for the King chooſeth properly, and the Dean and Chapter can't reject the Perſon whom he recommends, and name another for him, nor are the Dean and Chapter the juſt Repreſentatives of the Clergy and People of the Dioceſs whoſe ſuffrages were required of old in the deſignation of a Biſhop as all Men of ingenuity, who have the leaſt acquaintance with Cyprians Epiſtles, muſt acknowledge. Again the Canons forbid Biſhops to meddle with ſecular affairs upon pain of deprivation, it ſeems our Canonical Author has never ſeen that Canon which runneth thus. Let not a Biſhop Presbyter or Deacon aſſume Worldly Cares, and if he doth, let him be depoſed; but our Scotiſh Prelats did aſſume Worldly Cares, ſome of them Miniſters of State, more of them were ordinarily Members of the Privie Council, and all of them Lords in Parliament, and in all theſe Capacities Judged in Civil, and as Members of Parliament and Council in Criminal matters, and made Penal Lawes reaching life and fortune, and conſequently ſo Canonical were they, that by this Canon all of them ought to have been depoſed, ſo that if this Gentleman take my advice, the next time he gives an account of his Prelats, he muſt not call them Canonical as he would not expoſe himſelf to ſcorn and provoke others to lead out a more numerous Army of Canons to beat off their Mitres, and to drive themſelves and their Adherents from the Communion of the Church, though it be impoſſible to drive vain Men among them from their ratling and raving and talking of the ancient Canons, which they have never ſeen, amongſt their ignorant or prejudicated admirers teaching them as parrats to call Presbyterians Schiſmaticks.

2. I abſolutely deny that Prelacy was duely conſtitute in the 62. when K. 2. *Parl*: 1. Seſſ. 2. Act: 1. did by vertue of his Royal Prerogative, and inherent right of the Crown in a moſt *Eraſtian* manner without any Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution introduce the ſame, and that contrary to the Oath and Covenant of God which he himſelf, *Parliament*, and the whole Nation

tion had ſolemnly entered into. If this was a due Conſtitution of a Church: I queſtion much if ever there was any Church unduly conſtituted, and it is very remarkable that from the 62 to the late Hapyy Revolution thoſe uſurping Prelates, aud Deputies of the State, rather then Miniſters of Chriſt, in reſpect of their Prelatical Power durſt never adventure to call a National Convocation or Aſſembly, to canvas and approve of their ſtrange and unacountable introduction; but for further Satisfaction, I refer the Reader to *Remarks* page 33, 34. So that tho' Prelacy were lawful, it was not duely Conſtitute and Eſtabliſhed here.

3. I muſt tell this Gentleman, that Presbyterians deny *Prelacy* to be a lawful Government, and upon this account, I deny that his Church was duely conſtitute, nor will his ſaying (page 4 *Plain-Dealing*, I *think there are few or none in their right Wits, that will aſſert the unlawfulneſs of Prelacy*, nor his pretending to know, *that it is impoſſible to demonſtrate it*) ſhake but confirm them in their Judgment. It's no new thing to find the Goſpel it ſelf, and the preaching of it reckoned Fooliſhneſs by a Set of Men that ſet up for Witts 1 *Cor.* 1. 18. And conſequently muſt not account it ſtrange, if thoſe who profeſs the ſame, and are zealous for the Government of Gods Houſe be reputed unwiſe and and fooliſh, 1. *Cor.* 1. 25. but ſtill the Fooliſhneſs of God is wiſer than Men, and it is no great Evidence of Wiſdom and Soberneſs in our Author to condemn, and to ſend to Bedlam all theſe eminently Pious and Learned Divines, that have written againſt the Lawfulneſs of *Prelacy*, and ſo much for the firſt part of the *Minor*, I now come to the

2. *Part* which I alſo denyed, *viz.* that the *Prelatical* Church required no ſinful Terms of Communion, and it ſeems this Gentleman has forgot what was ſaid. *Rem.* on the *Caſe* page 42, for the Author made this Defence for the Presbyterians who ſcrupled to joyn in Communion to hear the Prelatiſts *viz.* that beſide their ſolemn Engagements againſt *Prelacy*, their hearing of *Prelatiſts* was impoſed and required as a Teſt and Sign of their approbation of *Prelacy*: The Act of *Parliament* runneth thus, *and His Majeſty doth expect from all his good and dutiful Subjects a due acknowledgment of, and hearty complyance with His Majeſties Government Eccleſiaſtical as it is now by Law eſtabliſhed within this Kingdom, and that in order thereto they will give their cheerful Concurrence, Countenance and Aſſiſtance, to ſuch Miniſters, as by publick Authority are or ſhall be admitted in their ſeveral Paroches, and attend all the ordinary meetings for Divine Worſhip in the ſame, ſo His Majeſty doth declare that He will, and doth account withdrawing from, and not keeping and joyning in theſe Meetings to be Seditious, and of dangerous Example and Conſequence.* *Ch.* 2. *Parl.* 1. *Seſſ.* 3: *Act* 1. And ſeeing

that Presbyterians looked upon Prelacy as a thing sinful, and found themselves by their Solemn Oaths and Covenants obleiged not only not to own it but to disown it, and to oppose it, and their joyning with Prelatical Ministers being by the abovenamed Act, required of them, as an Evidence of their Approbation of His Majesties Government Ecclesiastical; perhaps our Author would find a Difficulty to show me. how they could do it without Sin, especially when God afforded them an opportunity of a Presbyterian Minister to joyn with, which they did not fail to embrace, notwithstanding of the outmost hazards they wre exposed unto for so doing, and upon the whole the Judicious and Impartial Reader shall easily perceive how inconcludent the *Plain-Dealers* Argument is, and therefore that he may be brought to his Repentance for bringing it into the Field, I will turn the Canon upon him as was done already in the *Reply* page 15, and I do not in the least doubt but it shall be found that I am absolute Master of his Artillery, tho' he confidently asserts the contrary, and I proceed thus. To separate from a Church duely constitute, wherein nothing is required, as a condition of Communion which is sinful, is to be guilty of *Schism*, But to separate from the present established Prpsbyterian Church, is to separate from a Church duely constitute, that requires no sinful Terms of Communion, and therefore those that separate from her are guilty of *Schism*. And now I say the *Major* is incontravertible, and as for the *Minor* it was clearly proven in the *Reply* pag. And I remember it was said perhaps our *Plain-Dealer* will tell us our Church is not duely constitute because we want Prelats, but then as is there said most of the Reformed Churches, are not duely constitute; but because I love not to repeat, I refer the Reader to the forcited page of the *Reply*. Again I said that not only is our Church constitute as it was before the 62, but the Terms of Communion are the same, and seeing the Author of the *Defence*, of the *Plain-Dealing*, and of the *Case* acknowledge there was no *Schism* in this Church before the 66, and that notwithstanding of all the changes with respect to the Church Government the respective Parties, both Ministers and People choose generally to hold Communion with one another page 18 of the *Case*. I said it appeared pretty plain that it was in vain to pretend they cannot now in Conscience joyn.

2. That if the Particulars the *Plain-Dealer* enumerats page 4, 5, 6. As Terms required of the Church be not required whither they are sinful or not; they ought not to scruple Prelatists, and to speak of them here is so far from *Plain-Dealing* that it will be called either *Simple-Dealing* or *Double-Dealing*, as being utterly beside the Purpose, one would think our Author was obleiged to take notice of these Arguments, especially the first, but he

toucheth

toucheth it not, and the 2d. ſo very ſlenderly that I am tempted to think he found it too hot for him, has he not then given me a fair opportunity with far greater reaſon to return him his own Complement: *Our Author found himſelf preſſed here, what a benefite is it for a Man to be ſo wiſe as not to meddle with what is too hard for him, and forget what he minds not to remember.*

And then I came to a particular Conſideration of the ſinful Terms of Communion, which as he pretended our Church required of their Miniſters and People, wherein no doubt the impartial Reader will find I eſtabliſhed the 2d. part of my *Minor*, and conſequently the Charge of *Schiſm* againſt thoſe who ſeparate from the eſtabliſhed Church. But now he complains page 10. firſt that he had inſiſted long on the Churches requiring Prelatical Miniſters to declare their Grief and Sorrow for ſerving under Prelacy. This as in ſeveral Prints before I deny to be a Term of miniſterial Communion. 2. He complains that the Government of the Kirk conſiſting of Parity is the only Government inſtituted by Chriſt in his Houſe, and that they ſhould adhere thereto all the days of their Lives is alſo a Term, but to this I give the foreſaid Anſwer as has been given again and again in the Remarks upon the *Caſe* and *Poſtſcript* thereof, and the very inſerting of this *Formula* page 18 of the *Reply* was the moſt ſatisfying Anſwer, that could be given, and ſeeing theſe things are not required of Miniſters when they are aſſumed, I was not in the leaſt oblieged to enter in Debate about them. 3. He complains that the Church require the ſigning the Confeſſion of Faith ratifyed by Law, but pretends this I paſſed over in ſilence, ſtrange! To find a Man aſſert after this rate, for in the 16 page of the *Reply* I made a clear Reference to the 2d. *Letter*, and to the *Poſtſcript* to the *Remarks* upon the *Caſe*, where it will be found thoſe ſcruples, and this in particular are fully removed, and now I do refer the Reader, *Remarks* page 16, 17, 18. Page 37. For it muſt not be thought that I can be oblieged to repeat one and the ſame thing again and again, nor muſt our Author take the Liberty to ſay this, and that is not anſwered becauſe I will not ſo repeat, and whither he or I deſign to ſhamm the World as he words it, ſeeing ſolid Anſwers are given to theſe things he ſpeaks of, which have not been noticed by him tho' direct References were made to them, let the impartial Reader judge. Nay but our Author will tell us that the Anſwers in *the Remarks are not worth the noticeing*, but are they leſs worth the noticing than the triffling Reply? And ſeeing he has ſpent ſo many Sheets upon this, might he not have beſtowed a few upon theſe Anſwers in the *Remarks*. I know the ſecret, to have medled with, thoſe anſwers was to have ſpoiled the pretty Story of *Plain-Dealing* which he was to gratify the World with, nor muſt they be touched now for the

ſame Reaſon, and the *Reply* muſt be called *triffling*, not becauſe it was judged ſo, but becauſe he judged it, for his Intereſt to call it ſo, and the *full and final Anſwer* muſt appear upon the Stage tho' It ſhould not contain one Syllabe to the purpoſe, that prejudicated perſons may have it to ſay, O! Such a Pamphlet has got a full and final Anſwer, ſuch a learned Dr. has written many Sheets upon it tho' perhaps they have neither ſo much Time nor Judgment as duely to conſider the one or the other. Page 16. I began to take notice of the charge he advanceth againſt our Worſhip, and here I muſt infer the Reader to what I ſaid in the *Reply* page 17. And here for the Satisfaction of the Reader I ſhall give his Scruples a more full conſideration, firſt, he pretends *Plain-Dealing* page 6. That it is required of Miniſters not to read the Scriptures in their Congregations, as a Term of Miniſterial Communion. *Anſw.* It is a manifeſt Untruth to alledge this is made a Term of Miniſterial Communion, and to pretend that the reading of the Scriptures is excluded by the univerſal Practice of Presbyterians is ſuch a peice of *Plain-Dealing* as cannot well be accounted for, do not Miniſters generally read an entire Chapter, giving the Senſe of it, each Lords Day? And if any do otherways, they fall ſhort of that Uniformity enjoyned, and if any Miniſter ſhall read two Chapters ſurely he ſhould be ſo far from being lyable to Challenge, that he would be reckoned to be more obſervant of the Directory than thoſe who do otherways, and altho' ſome allow their School-maſters or Precenters to read the Scriptures as at *Aberdeen* and ſeveral other places which I could name before the Congregation he conſtitute, yet many think this Ordinance of God ſhould not be gone about before the Congregation be conſtitute, and much doubt If any not in Office, ſhould meddle with this publick Ordinance publickly, and in the Church, yet in this there is a mutual Forbearance exerciſed; and our Author if he could without prejudice conſider matters he might ſee a vaſt difference between precenting or raiſing the Pſalm, and the publick reading of the Word in the Churches; for every perſon in the Congregation has a Right to the actual and audible ſinging of the Pſalms, and it matters not much who begin, only it's neceſſary that thoſe who have Skill ſhould do it, but I hope none will pretend that every perſon, Man and Woman has a right to the Active and Audible Performance of other Offices or Ordinances in the Church. And as for Probationers their Lecturing and Preaching *&c.* It's for the Exerciſe and Tryal of their Gifts, and that they may give evidence of their aptneſs to teach, as their very name doth denote, and this is of a peice with their Tryals before the Presbytery. And upon the whole, ſeeing matters are indeed as here repreſented, every Man of Conſci-

Conſcience and Ingenuity, ſhall eaſily obſerve, that there is no ground of Scruple here.

2. *Plain-Dealing* page 6. He pretends that Presbyterians Preach Doctrines, which he and Men of his Kidney cannot Preach, the Author of the *Caſe* made this pretence before, and received an Anſwer, and I could even wiſh our Author had told us what particular Doctrines Miniſters are required to preach, as Terms of Miniſterial Communion, which he cannot cloſe with; but enough of this already *Remarks* upon the *Caſe* page 37. to which I refer the Reader for Satisfaction.

3. He pretends they cannot in Conſcience joyn with the eſtabliſhed Church in Miniſterial Communion, becauſe the Doxology is not ſung in our Churches, to this I anſwer, Conſcience hath that for its Rule, which Faith hath for it's Object, the Word of God, and therefore unleſs this Gentleman can point out a Divine Precept in the Word, for the uſe of theſe four Lines, I muſt ſay he underſtands not what a Scruple of Conſcience means, when he condeſcends on this as one. *Plain-Dealing* page 6. But is he a Man of tender Conſcience, yes ſurely if it be a Mark of a tender Conſcience to Reproach and Calumniate Presbyterian Miniſters as he doth p. 8. *Plain-Dealing*, theſe good Men [meaning Presbyterian Miniſters] uſe neither to Sing nor to ſay Glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt inexpreſs words, *it's true* in the 19 page *full and final Anſwer*, he ſayes did he ever charge Presbyterians as *Antitrinitarians*, I do not pretend that he advanced ſuch a Charge but it's plain he ſaid in that forcited 8 page, that Presbyterians uſe neither to ſing or ſay the Father Son and Holy Ghoſt in expreſs Words, than which nothing more untrue could have been ſaid of them or leſs to the Purpoſe in hand.

4. *Full and final Anſwer* p. 18, 19. He pretends they cannot in Conſcience joyn, becauſe they cannot exclude the Lords Prayer out of their Devotions, as if forſooth the excluding of the Lords Prayer were a Term of Miniſterial Communion. This I have more than once refuſed, as a moſt impudent Falſehood, and for full Satisfaction I refer the Reader to the *Remarks on the Caſe* page 17, 18, and 38. Where the Reader will find this Point fully ſpoke to, and ſuch Arguments adduced for removing this Scruple and expoſing the Falſhood of it, as our Author thinks fitt, not to grapple with. It's true he tells me that thoſe Anſwers are fully confuted and baffled by the Author of the *Caſe*, but when the impartial Reader ſhall be pleaſed to compare Matters, he will eaſily find our Author hath wronged his Reputation in ſo ſaying, and that the Author of the *Caſe* has not ſo much as once attempted to anſwer, what was there ſaid upon this Point, altho' he continues to aſſert, and that over the belly of the cleareſt Light and ſtrongeſt Reaſon, which looks like a pertinacious Adherance to the Concluſion, when the Premiſſes are fully removed.

5. They cannot joyn, becauſe they cannot deny Baptiſm to weak and dying Infants that cannot be brought to Church, nor the Sacrament of the Lords Supper to dying Chriſtians, *Plain-Dealing* page 7. I Anſwer firſt, this is not a Term of Miniſterial Communion [2] I refer my Reader to the *Reply* page 17. where he will find a full account of this matter which may yeild any impartial Man full Satisfaction, and as there is not any thing there ſaid, which is not notourly known, ſo I am not much concerned whither this Gentleman, and his fellows believe it or not, for it's nothing ſtrange to find theſe that have an uſe of ſpeaking broad Suſpicions of the Veracity of others. The Miniſters are indeed far from being ſo Erroneous as to entertain that cruel Doctrine, which our Author hath eſpouſed, *viz.* That Infants cannot obtain Salvation in the ordinary way preſcribed in the Goſpel without Baptiſm, if this be not a new Doctrine in this Kingdom, then ſure there was never a new Doctrine broached in it, and I am very confident that the Doctrine of our Church is moſt agreeable to the Scriptures, as it is in the Confeſſion of Faith Chap. 28. And I am very ſure the citeing of it by our Author in his 12 page doth ſignify his diſlike to it, ſhall make for the honour of our Confeſſion, and tend to the Authors Diſgrace, amongſt all Pious and Orthodox Chriſtians, the Words of the Confeſſion which he citeth are theſe, *that Grace and Salvation are not ſo inſeparably annexed to it*, viz. Baptiſm as *that no perſon can be regenerated or ſaved without it.* It were eaſy to expoſe the contray Opinion, but it not being my preſent purpoſe, I ſhall only ſay we have reaſon to Bleſs God that there are none of our Miniſters or People who have fallen into that unmerciful and cruel Error, and earneſtly beg God may preſerve this Church from being plagued with Miniſters of that Opinion, and of ſuch as are neceſſarly connected to it, and ordinarly accompany it.

6. They think it neceſſary to commemorate at ſet times the Nativity, Circumciſion, Paſſion, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, the Deſcent the Holy Ghoſt. In anſwer to this I referre the Reader to what is ſaid on this head *Reply* p. 17. and in the mean time I muſt plainly tell my *Plain* Man that in this one point eſpecially conſidering what he adds *full and final anſwer* p. 11. there is as much falſe hood and deſingenuity as perhaps can well be contain'd in ſo much bounds, were theſe anniverſary and feſtival dayes obſerved through all this Nation in time of Prelacy? no they were not. Are they obſerved by Prelatical Miniſters that are yet in their Churches? no they are not. Did the Miniſters of *St. Andrews?* or *Dundee?* or in any other Town in *Scotland* upon circumciſion day, paſſion day, &c. Preach upon Texts ſuitable to the ſolemnity as this Man falſely alledges? no they did not, ſome of them are alive ſtill, and they have more ingenuity than

pre-

pretend it, perhaps ſome one Pedant, or Engliſh ape ſomwhere or other adventured to do ſo, but I never knew a Prelatical Miniſter fixed in any Charge that had that cuſtome, but then this Gentleman makes a fearful outcry. Did ever our Church, ſayes he, make acts againſt theſe things *Plain-Dealing* indeed? Good Sir! tell me where ever your Church as you, call it mett in a National Aſſembly to make acts from the year 62 to the Revolution, and I will let you ſee that in that meeting they made acts againſt all theſe things, and here our Authors task ſhall be equally as hard as mine; and in fine to make this a ſcruple of Conſcience is to miſtake Conſcience for humour, and the cuſtome of ſome particular Churches for the foundation and rule of Chriſtian faith and practice, than which nothing can be more unworthy of a Divine.

7. As for what he ſayes of the rehearſing of the Creed commonly called the Apoſtles at Baptiſm, the Confeſſion of the Church ratified by law contains all the Articles of the Apoſtolick Creed, and the uſe of that at Baptiſm and the exceptions againſt it are fully ſpoke to on the *Remarks* upon *the Caſe* p. 19. & 39. and our *Plain Dealer* with an unaccountable and obſtinate wilfulneſs waving the Conſideration of what is there ſaid, I referre the impartial Reader for full ſatisfaction, and in the mean time I muſt tell him that to inſinuate as he doth that Prelatical Miniſters are depoſed as erroneous and unſound Men, becauſe they rehearſe the Creed and uſe not the Confeſſion of the Church is ane obſtinate and an unaccountable Calumny, and in a word to pretend that they can not in Conſcience join with the eſtabliſhed Church, becauſe the Miniſters do not rehearſe, or becauſe they would not be allowed to rehearſe the Creed at Baptiſm while in the mean time no Scripture precept enjoining the ſame can be adjoined, it ſeems to proclaim a Man ignorant of what Conſcience means.

8. He pretends that by vertue of the Uniformity they muſt not bow the knee when they enter the Pulpit if they ſhould be aſſumed; in anſwer to this as I am convinced private Prayer ſhould have ſuitable Circumſtances as to time and place, ſo I am confident it was not the Cuſtom of Prelatical Miniſters to fall down on their Knees in the Pulpit in time of Prelacy, nor do they all ſo yet, either in Meeting-Houſes, or in Churches; and for the ſingular Faſhions of ſome few, either now or then; I am not to account but to pretend they cannot in Conſcience joyn with the Eſtabliſhed Church, leſt they ſhould be obleiged to forbear that Practice, and that they will rather rend the Church of God in peices, is to give the World ſuch an account of their Conſciences as will tempt many to think they have no Conſcience at all.

9. They cannot in Conſcience joyn, leaſt when they are Hearers they muſt *not Stand in time of Prayer*, nor *uncover the Head in time of Sermon*, *Plain-Dealing* page 7. I think our Authors Conſcience is ſomewhat unaccountable, do not Presbyterians ſtand in time of Prayer, and many uncover their Heads in time of Sermon, and for my part I very much approve of it, and ſo do all I have ſpoken with upon that Head: Altho' Weakneſs and Infirmity may ſometimes require the contrary. And God loves Mercy rather then Sacrifice, and will our Author pretend that all the Prelatiſts in the Nation, always uncover the Head in time of Sermon, and ſtand in time of Prayer. many of them do ſo, and many do otherways, and in this I know no difference between the Practice of *Presbyterians* and *Prelatiſts*, and our Author for as unacquented as he ſeems to be with our Faſhions, knows perfectly well that the forbearance of theſe poſtures is not required of the Church, as a Term of Communion; and conſequentiy, that he is impoſing upon the World, or rather expoſing himſelf to Scorn, in pretending it.

10. He pretends, they cannot in Conſcience joyn, leaſt they ſhould be obleiged to forbear to kneel at the Lords Table. O wonderful! Did the *Prelatiſts* do ſo in time of *Prelacy* throughout the Nation, or do they ſo at this day? Sure to write or inſinuate that they did, or that they do ſo, is ſuch a ſurpriſing thing, and ſo contrary to the Senſe and Knowledge of the whole Nation, that had I ſtumbled upon it, our Author would have reckoned me the moſt affronted Impoſtror, that ever appeared in *Print*. But to pretend with our Author *full and final Anſwer* page 15. that the partaking of the Lords Supper, ſitting or in a Table *Poſture*, was firſt introduced by the *Arians*, can never be ſaid with any ſhew of Reaſon. unleſs Chriſt and His Apoſtles be judged *Arians*, for beyond all Controverſy they did Partake of that Ordinance in a Table *Poſture*: It would appear to me this Gentleman is not well acquainted with, or doth not much regard the Canons, unleſs he imagines they fire on *Presbyterians*; is not kneeling on the Lords Day diſcharged by the Canons, and I bid him open Defiance to produce me one Canon for many Centuries requiring Kneeling at the Euchariſt. And I am of opinion that that poſture was not uſed untill the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, and the Idolatrie of the Maſs began to be entertain'd, let him diſprove it, if he can.

11. *Plain-Dealing* page 7. He pretends that by an Implicite Faith, if they comply, they are obleiged to conform to *whatever the Kirk ſhall afterwards Authoriſe and Ordain*, to clear this I adduced *Reply* page 17, 18. The Terms of Miniſterial Communion enacted by the Aſſembly, in which there is no ſuch thing contained, and it's certain, tho' there be ſome ſuch thing

thing in an Act of Parliament, yet it is as certain the Church never made uſe of any Act of *Parliament* on that occaſion, nor did they ever require Miniſters of any *Perſwaſion*, to make any ſuch promiſe; an Evidence ſo full as no Man can reſiſt, but ſuch an one as has the Conſcience to write or ſwear the *Sun* is not ſhining, even while his eyes are made to dazle, and to water by the brightneſs of it's Beams, or ſo frantick, as with the old *Philoſophers* or Stoicks to deny Motion, while their tongues were moving in their Mouths. And to pretend the Terms of Miniſterial Communion which I gave were not full and true, is ſuch a wilful and palpable Miſtake, as every School-Boy by inſpecting the Act may diſcover and the Reaſon added *full and final Anſwer* page 14, is ridiculous at leaſt, to call it no worſe. Why ſays he? My account of the Terms are not full, *becauſe the expreſs Abrenunciation of Epiſcopal Principles is left out*, now he and I were in Debate about the Terms of Miniſterial Communion required by the Aſſembly; he alleadges they require an *expreſs Abrenounciation of Epiſcopal Principles*, I ſay they do not, and produced the Act of Aſſembly containing the Terms required, in which there is nothing of that, and he pretends the Terms are not full, juſt as if I were in Debate with a *Prelatical* Miniſter, and ſhould alleadge the *Teſt* they required *Presbyterians* to take, contained an expreſs Abrenunciation of the Proteſtant Religion, and he to confute me ſhould lay the *Teſt* it ſelf before me, and that after reading of it, and finding no ſuch Clauſe in it, I ſhould ſay O! The *Teſt* is not full, I would be very loath to put ſuch a manifeſt affront upon my Intellectuals, but then he tells me we cannot deny but we require it; I ſay you have the Terms of the Aſſembly, it's not in the Power of any inferior Judicatory to alter them; and whereas he ſays the Author of the Letter acknowledges that the aboveſaid *Abrenunciation* is required, but was wiſer than to point at the place, ſure there is no ſuch thing there, it is a manifeſt Falſehood.

Page 16, 17. He ſpeaks much in the Commendation of the Holy Scriptures, and I am perſwaded they can never be ſufficiently commended and eſteemed, but to pretend that in our Churches there is but a few Verſes not an entire Chapter read at a time, and to ſpeak as if in this Conformity or Uniformity were required, is ſo monſtrouſly falſe and diſingenuous, as that his own Lips and *Paper* do condemn him, doth he not acknowledge page 16, that the Directory for Worſhip recommends the reading of two Chapters.

Page 17. He pretends that the reading and expounding of Scripture are contended for by Presbyterians, as inſeparably and indiſpenſably connected together: Sure Presbyterians contend for no ſuch thing, and I heartily

ly wiſh God may not contend with our Author, but forgive him for what he doth ſo unjuſtly and unreaſonably advance againſt Presbyterians. Now I have gone over the Scruples advanced by the *Plain-Dealer*, why he and thoſe of his Perſwaſion cannot in Conſcience joyn in Miniſterial Communion with the eſtabliſhed Church, and in ſpeaking to theſe I have alſo taken in all the Scruples he ſpoke of, why the People of his Perſwaſion cannot in Conſcience joyn with the Eſtabliſhed Church, tho' I am perſwaded, he, nor no other perſon ever received any Commiſſion from the people to advance Scrupples in their Name, ſo that what they have done this way, is deſigned rather to creat Scruples where they are not, rather than give an account of thoſe that are: After all the impartial and judicious Reader ſhall obſerve, that the whole of theſe Scrupples, are entirey removed with reſpect to the People, and even with reſpect to the Miniſters, unleſs the owning and ſubſcribing the Confeſſion of our Church (which is indeed required of all Miniſters) be reckoned a ſinful Term of Communion, and even in this the Practice of this Church, as well as the Confeſſion it ſelf, doth moſt harmonieuſly agree with that of other Churches; Doth not the Church of *England* require her Miniſters to ſubſcribe their Articles? did not the Proteſtant Church of *France* require her Miniſters to ſubſcribe their Confeſſion, yea did not the Prelatiſts in time of Prelacy require Miniſters and others not only to ſign, but to ſwear to the Confeſſion of Faith, and Standard of Doctrine then ratified by Law, ſo that it would appear our Author and Men of his Stamp can expect Miniſterial Communion no where, eſpecially when I conſider the Arguments he uſes *Plain-Dealing* page 6. againſt the ſigning of our Confeſſion, why ſays he, it is compiled by Men-- and contains many controverted Doctrines, cannot be ſuppoſed to be of infallible Veracity, which equally militates againſt the Confeſſions of all the the Churches on Earth: but enough of this, let me therefore return to my Argument which ſtands firm, and ſtable in all it's Parts.

They that ſeparate from a Church duely conſtitute, which impoſes no ſinful Terms of Communion, are guilty of *Schiſm*, but thoſe that ſeparate from the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, ſeparate from a Church duely conſttute, which impoſes no ſinful Terms of Communion, and therefor they that ſeparate are guilty of *Schiſm*. Now I am ſure I have dealt fairly with our Author, and I have been ſo far from impoſing on the Reader in neglecting any thing material, that I have particulariy conſidered and ſpoke to ſeveral things that may be thought of no great moment tho' advanced and muſtered up by him with great parad. And how he ſhall find a way of eſcape if he ſuffer Conſcience and Reaſon

to

to work, I ſee not. To carp at our Church as not duely conſtitute, after what has been ſaid will but expoſe him, and I muſt farther add that there may be failours in a Churches Conſtitution, and yet it may be highly ſinful to ſeparate from that Church, unleſs Men be called to own that as Right, which they judge wrong in the conſtitution, which muſt not, nor cannot be pretended in our caſe, altho' Presbyterians were required in Law to hear Prelatical Miniſters, as an evidence of their approbation of *His Majeſties Government Eccleſiaſtical*, and I am very hopeful he will not adventure to talk any more of the ſinful Terms of Communion impoſed by our Church, and I muſt add that tho' Miniſterial Communion could not be had on eaſy Terms, as indeed it may, yet if Church Communion cannot be ſcrupled, it is moſt unaccountable as ſavouring too much of *Self* for Miniſters to creat or keep up a Diviſion on that Head; I am of opinion our *Plain-Dealer* would have reckoned his Brethren who were thrown out of the Churches, becauſe they could not in Conſcience take the *Teſt*, guilty of a horrid *Schiſm* if they had ſet up ſeparate Meetings. And upon the whole, it may juſtly be expected the *Plain-Dealer* will cheerfully acknowledge that his Scrupples are removed, and cordially joyn with us in preſſing Unity and Concord, which is our Strength and Security againſt the common Adverſary, as he would not fall under the Apoſtles Admonition and Cenſure. *Rom.* 16. 17. and found to bid open defiance to all thoſe pathetick Exhortations in Scripture, to Unity and Concord,

Page 19. He refers the Reader to the Examination of Mr *Meldrums* Sermon concerning the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination, and I refer to the Vindication of that Sermon, as well as to Biſhop *Stillingfleet* and Dr. *Forbes* in their *Irenicums* and to Dr. *Field* upon the *Church*.

Page 19. He tells the account I give there of Presbyterian Miniſters and People, are miſrepreſented, it's eaſy for him to ſay ſo; however I appeal to thoſe that live in thoſe Bounds, I ſpoke of, with whoſe Knowledge and Conſcience all I ſpoke is conſiſtent.

Page 20. He aſſerts that an Allowance from a *Biſhop* to exerciſe the Power of Presbyters to the Presbyterian Miniſters, that complyed in the 62, was equivalent to Epiſcopal Ordination in that Caſe. However it's certain, Ordination by a *Biſhop* is one thing, and Allowance from a *Biſhop* to exerciſe the Power of Presbyters in a particular Church is an other thing; and it's as certain, that Ordination confers the Power, but an Allowance to exerciſe the Power of Presbyters, ſuppoſes it: And no *Biſhop* in *England* or *Scotland* will pretend the Contrary, and conſequently the *Biſhops* granting Allowance to Miniſters in the 62, who had been ordained by Presbyters only to exerciſe their Office, was a plain owning of their former Or-

dination to be valid and a plain Demonſtration that in their Judgement, Prelatical Ordination was not neceſſary, and to ſay as our *Plain-Dealer* there, that it was *not neceſſary in that Caſe* is to yeild the Point, and in *Broad Scots* to ſay, that theſe who are ordained by Presbyters, as the complying Mininiſters in the 62 were ſtand in no need to be Reordained by a Prelate, which I ſhall eaſily grant: and then he concludes. Thus I have anſwered all he brings againſt my Arguments in *the Plain-Dealing*, to prove that he and thoſe of his Perſwaſion cannot joyn with the Presbyterians, upon the account of the ſinful Terms of Communion; and I appeal to the impartial Reader, if they have the leaſt ſhadow of Scruple, what is there ſaid being conſidered, and conſequently if a Toleration be not abſolutly unneceſſary.

Page 21. I will not enter into a ſwrangling with our Author, about what he ſaid and what I ſaid, let the impartial Reader conſider and compare matters, and I am perſwaded he'll find that there is enough ſaid, and that his expoſtulatory Queſtions page 21, are aboundantly anſwered by what is above ſaid for what he pretends page 22, concerning the peoples driving ſome Epiſcopal Miniſters in the *Weſt-Country*, and of my approving of the fact, this has been fully ſpoken to and obviated *Remarks* pag. 14. For with what is there ſaid I fully agree, and to it I referre the Reader, I ſtill ſay its a notorious falſehood to pretend Prelatiſts have met with ſevere proceedings upon the account of their perſwaſion, and the baniſhment and impriſonment of ſome Meeting-houſe Miniſters is no evidence to the Contrary, for there is nothing more certain than that this was done not, becauſe they were Prelaticall; but becauſe they would not qualifie to the Civil Government, or becauſe they married Perſons irregularly or for ſome ſuch offence; He ſends me to page 14. of his *Plain-Dealing* where I find, but two particulars beſide what I have here conſidered tho' he braggs, He had filled up near a page with inſtances of our cruelties in perſecuting them for their perſwaſion. 'Tis a fine thing to ſpeak big, it ſeems he was in hopes ſome would read this Book that ſhould never be at the Pains to conſider the other, whereas indeed there is no particular inſtance given by him at all in the forcited place, only he ſayes, *It's well known we ſuffered upon the account of our Perſwaſion. Did they not conveen us before their Judicatories? bring forth Libels againſt us*: Is not this a notable proof? were they conveened becauſe they were Prelatical in their Judgment? Did their Libel contain any ſuch article? No ſurely, they contain'd matters of a groſſer nature, if this were an argument to prove that Men have ſuffered upon the account of their perſwaſion, it were eaſy to prove that Presbyterian Miniſters have ſuffered upon the account of their

perſwa-

perſwaſion, for ſome of them have been conveened before our Church judicatories, and depoſed for uncontraverted Scandals and Errors, ſo that in this, I ſhall leave it to the unbyaſſed to Judge whether our Author, beſt deſerves the Character, of a *Plain-Dealer*, or an Impoſtor.

But 2. He proves they ſuffered upon the account of their perſwaſion, *Plain-Dealing* page 14. by a wonderfull *medium* why, ſayes he, *did they not turn out ſome Miniſters, because they did not quatify themſelves to the Civil Government*; curious ſtuff, to be turned out for not owning the Civil Government is one thing, and to be turned out upon the account of their being prelatical in their perſwaſion is another thing. Now any perſon of ſenſe and diſcretion will ſee I paſſed over theſe becauſe they deſerved nonotice, and that it had been for our Authors advantage he had not obliged me to it.

Page 23. He will have it a Contradiction to ſay in the Letter that all the aim of a Toleration is to furniſh a maintenance to prelatical Miniſters, yet to deny the conſequence, he draws from it *Plain-Dealing*, viz, That many are willing to give it as I do in the *Reply* page 21. But I am of opinion a man may aim at a thing, and yet not obtain it, and if it were not ſo, our *Plain-man* would raiſe his aimes high enough, and thus ye ſee, the contradiction is in the head of the Author, not in the prints he has under Conſideration. And I refer the reader to the *Reply* pages 21. 22. page 23. He pretends I miſrepreſent an Argument of his, and I pretend the contrary, the impartial Reader muſt judge between us. It's true I added ſome Clauſes to his Argument for *Illuſtration*, and to hold forth the mater as it ſtood, and by ſo doing *I* made his hudled *Sophiſm* almoſt aſhamed to look an honeſt man in the Face, yea it ſeems the Father of that miſhapen Brat look't upon himſelf as affronted by it, when after a litle rubbing the verniſh fell off, and it's native Naughtineſs appeared, *I* refer the Reader to *Reply* page 22. *Ibidem*, He will allege it is an Eye-Sore for us that Prelatical Miniſters are ſuffered to live in this Kingdom, and then falls to his prayers againſt us. Truly *I* am as litle afraid of his Prayers as I am pinched by his Arguments. I ſhall only ſay, the Good Lord forgive him, for he is far in the wrong to us, and it is aſtoniſhing to ſee him ſo wicked as to addreſs the Throne of Grace with a ly in his Lips. He pretends *I* reproach them, but what he means *I* underſtand not. *I* have the place befor me, will he ſay that it is falſe that ſome Prelatical Miniſters

have been turned out for Scandal, and Errors, or for Disaffection to the Civil Government, and that it's highly unaccountable to suffer these to intrude upon Churches and planted congregations, is this to calumniate and reproach and that falsely, Nay, Nay, They are palpable Truths well knowu to all the Nation, and my *Plain-man* must skip them over and call them Reproaches.

I am not much concerned in his Wrangling page 24. Only *I* must say, it's some-what *Illogical* to pretend Presbyterian Ministers are unwilling to receive such as served under the late prelacy, because one Mr: *Ainsly* about whom he tels a long Story, the Truth of which *I* very much doubt, was mal-treated, and not readily received, for *a particulari ad Universale non valet Sequela.*

Page 25. He pretends *I* made a seeming Reply to the Answer he made *Plain-Dealing* page 10, And that *I* was all on fire when *I* wrote it, and *I* pretend the contrary, the reader must judge, and for his Satisfaction *I* refer him to the *Reply* pages 23. 24.

Page 26, He telles a long story about the little Kirk of *Elgin* invaded by a prelatist, but does he contradict any thing *I* said page 24? Yet I must correct him in one thing, that the Presbyterian Ministers there settled, had possession of it, and preached their weekly Sermons in it, it's strange to say there is no injury done, is the dividing and the distracting an unanimous Congregation no injury? I am of the opinion if that Presbyterians in that Country and Town, had invaded that Church in time of *Prelacy*, they would have reckoned them Injurious, and it's to be feared if such illegal *Practices* be not legally redressed, Force shall be opposed to Force, and sure the *Prelatists* shall be found the first Aggressors, for he who without Law invades my *Property* is the first Aggressor, even tho without Law *I* drive him from it.

Page 27. He pretends his Answer to the 2*d*. Argument in the Letter, from the inconvenience of granting a *Toleration* had touched me so sensibly that I was glad to pass it over, it's easy to say so, but the impartial Reader shall find nothing in it but a parcel of bare Assertions, and some of them most False and injurious, But as easily denyed as affirmed, and therefor it was I took no particular notice of them, and after all, it looks like a Falsehood to say that I passed this over without any Reply. Seing page 24. I expressly said that the Reply to the 1*st*. Answer did effectually remove the Answer to the 2*d*.

He pretends page 28, that I gave no ſolid Reply to his third anſwer and I pretend the Contrary, and therefor the reader is referred to what is ſaid *Reply* pages 24. 25. He complains he had told me that ſome Congregations, lay long vacant in the *North*, even where *Popery* prevails, but I had taken no notice of it, and no wonder ſeing it makes nothing to the purpoſe, they being well planted now, but ſeing he will force me to ſpeak to it, *I* ſhall be fullie as plain as pleaſant upon that head, and here muſt take the Liberty to tell our Author that in this he looks not unlike the evil one, who firſt tempts, and then accuſeth. For men, yea Miniſters of his ſtamp did what they could to hinder the planting of Churches in the *North*, even where *Popery* had too much footing, and when Presbyterians were going to ſettle the Church, they adviſed Gentlemen to call Miniſters which they were ſure could not be got, as Mr. *Meldrum* from *Edinburg* that ſo the power of planting the Church might not fall in the Presbyteries hands, and conſequently might be kept ſtill vacant. yea a perſon of no ſmall conſideration and acquaintance withthoſe *helliſh* Artifices uſed the freedom to tell me that he for his part was ſo adviſed by a Prelatical Miniſter, for that very end above mentioned, but I forbear to name Perſons and Places. Again he complains that he told me that the holy Communion is but rarely adminiſtred in many places, and I muſt tell him this cannot be ſaid of many places of my acquantaince, where the Sacrament of the Supper is frequentlie adminiſtred, and if in ſome places of the *North* that ordinance be not adminiſtred where Presbyterian Miniſters are ſettled, If they have not ſpeciall reaſons for it, they are much to be blamed, its true in ſome places in the *North* where prelatical Miniſters are continued, the Sacrament is given yearly, (tho in other places ſo ſettled which I could name, it has not been given for 16. years and upwards) but to brag that the people in theſe places, are kept in aw by the Holy Communion is ſomewhat ſurpriſing, for in many of thoſe congregations iniquity doth abound as much as any where in the Nation, you ſhall find few that are not habitual and cuſtomary Swearers, yet all muſt have the Sacrament yearly, & theſe men are hardened in their Sins, & made to beleive that they ſhall go to heaven, tho they walk in the way of Wickedneſs, and then he alleges I give a Character of the outed Curats as extremely ugly as extravagantly falſe viz that they would be a Scandal to a Society of heathens. *the Popiſh Preiſts and Jeſuits are not by far ſo bad*; here my words and meaning too, are baſely miſrepreſented; which the

courteous reader ſhall eaſily obſerve by inſpecting *Reply* page 25. I was not ſpeaking of Prelatical Miniſters in general, nay nor yet of all their Meeting-houſe Preachers. but of a company whom in contempt I did indeed call outed Curats, and no name of contempt can be too high for them conſidering their Practices; and from them I ſaid a wicked & ſcandalous perſon might have all Chnrch Priviledges at eaſier Rates, then from a *Popiſh Prieſt* or *Jeſuit*, and of them I ſaid that they would be a ſcandal to a ſociety of heathens, and this was what I ſaid, And tho this Character be ugly indeed, it is not falſe, let alone, extravagantlie ſo, yea it is as true as any thing can be, and beſide other evidences the Presbytrie book of *Edinbrough* can bear witneſs, how that they have married men to other Mens-Wives *et. e contra*, antidated Teſtificats to cover Uncleanneſſes, married perſons after Proclamatiox of bans, but to other Perſons then thoſe they were proclamed with, and many ſuch horrid Diſorders, it had been our Authours Wiſdom not to have preſſed me ſo far againſt my Inclinaton to put this in Print, Pages 28. 29. He wrangles and miſrepreſents the matter, and I refer the reader to *Reply* page 25, For ſatiſfaction page 30. He will ſtill carry as if Presbyterians had Indulgence and Toleration all the time of Prelacy upon eaſy terms But I gave ſuch an account of this *Reply* page 26. That my *Plain man* was not ſo ſimple as to meddle with it, however the Reader may take notice of it, and for his further Satiſfaction I would alſo recommend to his Conſidration *Tolerations Fence Removed* page 7. 8. and 9. which will alſo convince the Reader how notoriouſly falſe and diſingenuous our Author is in aſſerting that in theſe days the ſtate never lifted up ther hand againſt Presbyterians till they liſted up their heel, againſt it.

Page 31. My *Plain Man* ſtoutly denys that his Friends in *Fife* in carrying on the Addreſs; did put down one and the ſame perſon under different Deſignations, however he pretends he has diſcovered the Miſtake that gave Riſe to that Story. *I* ſuppoſe he has made this Diſcovery by the ſame Faculty whereby he found Contradictions in my Paper; but for full Satisfaction *I* refer the Reader to the 31. Page of the *Remarks*. As for what he ſays againſt the Intention of introduceing Prelacy, tho' a *Toleration* be granted, deſerves no further Conſideration than what I gave it on the *Reply* page 27. For it's folly to wrangle where the Matter is ſo clear,

As

As for what he says apge 34, concerning the Hardship Prelatists have mett with, upon the account of their *Persuasion*; it is sufficiently spoke to already. Again he would have me malicious for saying page 15 of the *Reply* that *Presbyterians* oppose a *Toleration* because in their Judgements it would pave the Way to Prelacy, and so to Popery, all Circumstances being considered. It's needless to be more plain, tho' it were easy to clear this to a Demonstration. As for what he says concerning our Diffidence of the Inclinations of the people, I referr the Reader to pages 30 and 31 of the *Remarks* for satisfaction, where that matter is fully handled, and so convincingly too, that the *Plain-Dealer* and those of his Kidney are not able to advance the least Exception, nor have they to this day attempted to do it. As for what he says concerning the Indulgence in King *Charles* his Time and the *Toleration* in the time of King *James* *Plain-Dealing* page 16. and *Full and Final Answer* page 35. I shall only referr the Reader to the *Reply* pages 28 29 and 30, and if the impartial Reader will be at the pains to consider the questions propounded in the 16 page of the *Plain Dealing*, and the Answers made to them in the forcited places of the *Reply*, he shall easily perceive that our Author has been hard put to it, and that I have solid Reason to brand him for passing by the hardest Arguments, and dissembling Truths that are incontravertible-meerly because they make for us.

It is impossible, to hold forth the Disingenuity of this Man to the full, the Author of the *Letter* had said, if *Presbyterian* Ministers might have had Indulgence and Toleration upon their takeing the Oath of Alleadgance, owning the Civil Government, and praying expressly for the King, there had not been any one of them turned out, so far were they from turning themselves out by their own obstinacy, as the *Plain-Dealer* falsely alleadged. To his he answers *Full and Final Answer* page 35, that I and the whole Nation know that many of them, *Preachers* as well as People disowned the Kings Title and Authority, and would not redeem their Lives at the just and easy Rate of saying God save him, a notable return indeed, a notorious Falsehood, a most deliberate and obstinate Calumny, and contrived Reproach. Was there any one Minister of our Church at the 60 or 62 that disowned the Kings Title and Authority, or refused to Pray for the King? Or was there ever a *Presbyterian* Minister in *Scotland* turned out of their Churches for disowning the Kings Title? Or for not praying expressly for him either at that time or any other time? if he'l name me but one, I shall reckon him a performer of Impossibilities. And as for what he speaks of some called Presbyterians, that would not redeem their Lives at the Rate of saying God save the King, surely this was not before the Ministers were turned out, and consequently could not

be a Cauſe of that, yea ſure it was after the poor people were diſtracted by grievous Hardſhips, and unacountable Perſecutions, and as the ſerious and ſober *Presbyterians* of the Nation were far from juſtifying theſe few poor afflicted and fooliſh people that ſuffered Death becauſe they would not ſay God ſave the King, ſo I am ſure no ſerious nor judicious Perſon will approve thoſe that did execute them upon that account. I ſhall not now take notice of all the Cauſes which this Gentleman condeſcends upon for juſtifying the King and Parliament in obligeing Presbyterians to renounce the Covenant; but I muſt take notice of the modeſt Complement, and diſcreet Teſtimony which he is pleaſed to beſtow upon the Nobility Gentry, and Commons of this Nation that are Presbyterians as well as upon their *Predeceſſours* page 36, *Nay ſays he, if any Man will be at the pains to trace the Behaviour and Practice of the Presbyterian Zelots in* Scotland, *ſince the ſhort time they appeared on the Stage of the World unto this very day, it will be found they have been the* Scourges *of Monarchy, the Peſt and Bain of Civil Society, and greateſt Perſecutors that ever were ſeen amongſt Chriſtians of the Reformed Religion.* I am hopeful that after this, no ſober perſon will regard what this Libeler ſhall ſay of us. I did diſown the Declaration at *Sanquhair, Lanerick* &c. And ſo did the body of Presbyterians at that time in the Nation, and to this very day, our Church and people do diſown and are much grieved with the Practice of ſome few who of late years have made ſome ſuch Declarations as is well known, and will be frankly accknowledged by all that have not a formed deſign to miſrepreſent us, yea, and he muſt be a very great ſtranger to our Affairs, who knows not that, that ſmall handful of people do to this day follow a peculiar way of their own, and do not joyn in Communion with the Church, and conſequently their Miſcarriages cannot be imputed to us, and it's alſo certain, that when any of theſe wild People are by the pains and diligence of Miniſters and ſober and judicious Chriſtians brought over, they are alſo convinced of, and made to renounce their former diviſive Practices and Principles, and therefore the *Plain-Dealer* is injurious in aſſerting the Contrary page 38.

Pages 38, 39. He makes an unintelligible Wrangle about the argument taken from the Doctrine of Prelatiſts, in time of Prelacy *viz.* That there ought to be no Separation upon the account of Forms of Government, and therefore I referr the Reader to the Gentlemans *Letter*, where the Argument is uſed, and to the 30 and 31 pages of the *Reply*, where that Argument is further improven for Satisfaction.

Page 39. He pretends *Plain-Dealing* page 18, that he did prove from the Writings of their own Clergy, that they did not hold the Government

of

of the Church to be ambulatory, but to this I anſwer that whatever ſome have advanced in their Writings ſince the Revolution, it ſays nothing to what they taught from the Pulpit before the Revolution, and it is moſt certain that both from the pulpit, and by many other publick Deeds, they did declare the Government of the Church to be ambulatory in their Judgement, and all Judicious and Ingenuous Men muſt own the Oath of Supremacy to be demonſtration for this. Nor can the particular Sentiments of ſome two or three, yea or of halfa dozen of them who have wrote ſince the Revolution, be taken as the common judgement of their own Party, even at this time. Ay, but the *Plain-Dealer* pretends that from the Sacred Books of the New Teſtament, as well as from the Writings of their own Clergy; he had proven that our Bleſſed Lord had inſtituted Imparity among Church-Men *&c.* But alleadges that I thought it not fitt, ſo much as to mention theſe Reaſonings of his, they being too hard and knotty for Me, and commends me highly for that piece of Mother-Wit. I heartily wiſh that this Gentleman had once given me occaſion to commend him for his Ingenuity, for if in that forcited Paragraph of his *Plain-Dealing*, there be any thing of an Argument contain'd, or ſo much as one Text of the New Teſtament cited, then let this Gentleman be honoured with a Crown of Lawrels, but if there be nothing in that Paragraph but bare Aſſertions, as the Reader by inſpection ſhall ſoon diſcover, then it's eaſy to know what this Gentleman deſerves; and in the mean time I cannot commend his Mother-Wit, in obligeing me to give this juſt account of him, and his way. *Plain-Dealing* page 19. The Gentleman has theſe Words how can (*viz. Stillingfleet*) be ſaid, to own Epiſcopacy to be indifferent and ambulatory, and in the *Reply* page 31. I ſaid, to pretend that Dr. *Stillingfleet* did not look upon the Government of the Church to be ambulatory in his *Irenicum*, is to aſſume a liberty to call black white, and white black, and now the Return he makes page 39. He pretends that I am ſuch an one as cannot be ſatisfied, and truely it's hard if not impoſſible to ſatisfy any Man, that Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum*, doth not hold the Government of the Church to be ambulatory, and I am very ſure, that he who after Reading that Book, if he underſtands what he reads, and yet is capable to deny it, ought not to be admitted as a witneſs in any matter.

There is enough already ſaid concerning the *Teſt*, to ſatisfy the unbyaſſed Reader, but to pretend that Presbytry was eſtabliſhed here in the Days of King *Charles* the 1*ſt*. by Rebellion, is to reckon King *Charles* the 1*ſt*, and his Parliaments Rebellious, for there is nothing more plain, than that King *Charles the* 1*ſt*. both by his Commiſſioner, and by him-

ſelf in perſon did Eſtabliſh *Presbytry* by Act of *Parliament*, and now if King *Charles* the 1*ſt* as as well as his Son King *Charles* the 2*d*. and our *Parliaments* who eſtabliſhed and ratified the *Presbyterian* Government, were all Rebellious, I would gladly know againſt whom were they Rebells? Rebells againſt the Mitre no doubt: And now we underſtood the meaning of the Monarchical *Power* of the Prelate, which ſome and particularly Mr. *Seage* ſo frequently ſpeaks of, and ſeems to be ſo fond of.

Page 42, He will have me guilty of diſingenuous jugling, becauſe I had ſaid page 33, that the Prelatiſts in calling *Prelatical* Government Apoſtolick, did arraign the Claim of Right, and declare the Queens Claim to the Crown Unchriſtian, but let him lay as he wil, it's plain enough to me, that to alledge the States have declared an apoſtolical Conſtitution an inſupportable grievance, is to hold their declaration Unchriſtian, and ſeing the *Queens* Title is founded on ſuch a Declaration, by the moſt native Conſequence, they muſt hold it Unchriſtian too, I ſpend no more time about it, the matter is clear enough to all who allow themſelves, the free Exerciſe of their Reaſon.

Page 43. It was a wonderful Stoake of Impudence to alledge, that I load the whole Nation with that moſt foul and deteſtable Fact, the Murther of *King Charles* the 1*ſt*. and therefor I crave Common Juſtice, only that the Reader may conſider what is advanced by me *Reply* page 33, but I very well underſtand the pinch, the *Plain dealer* was brought to, and which hath made him fall into this effronted Calumny, for *Plain-dealing* page 26. this Gentleman had ſaid, ſpeaking of the Murther of King *Charles* the 1*ſt*. the only party they charge with it, are only thoſe who have never condemned that horrid, that bold, and inſolent Sin. Whereupon moſt natively I inferred the Presbyterians, then, are not the *Party* in the Nation aimed at; ſeeing it is mainifeſt that they did condemn that horrid that bold, and inſolent Sin, as is ſufficiently evidenced by the Publick Records of the Church, as well as by many other deeds and Actions. The Concluſion is ſo clear, and the Argument ſo pungent, that the *Plain-dealer* not having Ingenuity enough to accknowlege the Truth, nor ſtrength enough to bear of the force of the Reaſon, he is forced to fill up his pages with ſomewhat elſe, and now having vented this horrid and monſtrouſly falſe Calumny againſt me, he falls upon Presbyterians, and more eſpecially Presbyterian Miniſters, and to gain his Point, he brings in the Tranſactions of the Times between the year 38 and 40, but ſeeing they make nothing to the main Point in hand, the granting or not granting a Toleration, the keeping or not keeping of Communion with the preſent eſtabliſhed Church, they ſerve only

to

to hold forth the ill disposition and strong Inclination of the Author to prejudge the world against Presbyterians, but as I said before, the transactions of those Times are set in their due Light, and the Nation is aquitted of that horrid Crime even by strangers, and for further satisfaction, I referr the reader to Tolerations Fence removed p. 33. also p, 11.

I have also seen a Pamphlet entituled,

Imparity among Pastors, &c. Examined.

the Government of the Church by Divine Institution, as maintained in an *extempore* Debate *&c* and seeng I understand that Pamphlet, shall have an Answer by One that is more concerned, and far more fitt for the Undertaking I shall only take notice of it, in so far as it entrencheth upon the *Remarks on the case &c.* This *extempore Man*, gives us a surprising swatch 1*st*. of his Faith, and then of his Charity page 3. 4. 5. As for his Faith he says he is firmly perswaded *that Prelacy is the true Government of the Gospel Church, by Divine Right. that the sole Power of Ordnation and Jurisdiction belongs to the Prelate in Ecclesia constituenda, the said Power as sine qua non in Ecclesia constituta*, And several things to this purpose, to which I shall make no other return, but that perhaps this learned *Rabbi*, may find it more easy to believe those things then to prove them, or satisfy others about the grounds of his faith; as for his Charity we have a notable account of it, I give you it, in his own words page 4. *I am bound* (says he) in charity *to believe the worthy author of the Remarks &c. hath never seen that excelent Book, hath never considered what* Dr. Hammond *wrote against* Blondel *and* Salmasius and page 5. *nor so much as heard of* Mr Rutherfords *arguments in his Pauls Presbytry &c. likewise to reput him ignorant and a great stranger not only to antiquity but even to the modern learned Writers of the one and other perswasion*. A *charitable Man* indeed, but I must tell him, that as his charity is palpably a mock, so his faith is certainly a dream, and in the close he'l find himself as little oblidged to his faith, as the author of the Remarks is to his Charity, and now having given the world, some Illustrious instances of his faith and charity, he proceeds page 6. to give a notable account of his veracity and modesty, I most tell him (sayes he) if he had understood and considered, that the most famous Antiquaries that wrote for Presbytry, acknowledged that Episcopacy in the modest sense was introduced into the Church some 40 years after St. *John*'s death, indeed the Authour of the *Remarks on the Case* is obliged to him, for I very much doubt if ever any man would have told him so, if our author had not done it, for to pretend that the learned writers for Presbytery, or any one of them, learned or unlearned did acknowledge, that Episcopacy in the modern sense, was so early introduced into the Church, is such a monstrous untruth, that no man below our Authors confidence and Imagination

would have ventured on it, he will have the author of the *Remarks on the Case* contradict himself, becauſe he owns (as he pretends) *Ignatius Epiſtles* to be genuine, and yet denyes that there were Biſhops then of the modern, form throughout the whole Catholick Church: Good Sir? You had never ſeen a contradiction here, if you had not borrowed your Brother *Plain-Dealer* his ſpectacles, however I ſhal ſtill grant, he that ſees a Foundation in Scripture for Prelacy, may eaſily obſerve a contradiction here, and ſtrong is the power of imagination, is it any where ſaid in *Ignatius Epiſtles*, that there were Biſhops then (*in the moderen form*) throughout the whole Catholick Church, and why may not a man deny this, and yet hold thoſe Epiſtels to be genuine, but to be plain, I do not much doubt but *Ignatius* wrote Epiſtles, but that we have them pure, and entire, as *Ignatius* wrote them, no man was yet ever able to demonſtrate, and the exceptions led againſt their purity, by the Ingenious *Iameſon* are ſuch. that the unbyſſyed Reader muſt either own them to be interpolated; or have lower thoughts of them, and their Author then I am willing to entertain.

Page. 9. he reckons it Confidence in the Author of the *Remarks* to ſay, that there is nor one word in all the Revelation, intimating that the Angels of the *Aſiatick* Church, were ſingle perſons, much leſs ſuch as had power over Presbyters: but in my opinion it had been as much for our Doctors purpoſe, to have pointed at ſome one place or other in that book of ſuch an *I*ntimation, then to have called that a confident aſſertion, and it is a moſt certain truth, that a ſingle term, is often to be underſtood Collectively in Scripture, as *Perkins* upon the Revelation with ſeveral others do prove, and it ſemes plain to me, however it may appear to the Dr. even from the Context, that the word Angel is to be ſo taken, and ſeveral particulars are condeſcended on, to evince this, by the Author of the *Remarks*: it was our Dr. wiſdom not to take notice of the Duſt (as he terms it) raiſed by modern Presbyterian writers on this argument, leſt entring into it, he had been ſtiffled in it. but pag 10. he would gratify the world with a new argument, which is indeed nothing elſe, but the effect of his inconſideration, he produces a Scripture Luke 22. 31. 32. to prove that it is not univerſally true, that wherever in Scripture there is a tranſition from the ſingular number to the plural, there the ſingular term, is to be taken collectively, for ſays he, our Saviour ſaid *Simon Simon*, Satan hath deſired to have you, here is a true tranſition from the ſingular number *Simon Simon* to the plural, you you, notwithſtanding wherof the ſingular term, *Simon*, is not taken collectively, and thus he pretends to elude the exception raiſed againſt their *Achillean* Argument from the Angels of the

Aſiatick

Asiatick Churches, as ye have it in the 5. page of the *Remarks on the Case*, but this Gentle-man has fallen under a horrid mistake, there is no parallel here, for beside that a Transition in Luke may be denyed, and that our Saviour may be taken as informing *Peter*, of the deep designs of Satan against his whole disciples, and withal for *Peters* comfort, he told him, but *I* have prayed for thee, we are speaking, he would consider of appellative names, and we say that where ever in Scripture, the transition is from an Appellative, in the Singlar Number to the Plural, there the Appellative is to be taken Collectively; and this Good Disputant forsooth, pretends he has found a transition from a proper name, which cannot possibly be taken Collectively, and which makes nothing to the purpose; But what ever the Doctor may think of this, he has even given some occasion to say he has forgot the Rules of Disputation; And what makes most for his own cause, when he would cunningly turne over upon us, the proofe of a Negative *viz.* that the term Angel, is not to be taken as a single Person, And as signifying a Prelat in the modern sence, we do not found the doctrine of parity on that Text, It's their argument for imparity, and therefor it was incumbent on him to prove that the term Angel was so taken, and to be understood, and seing he has not so much as once attempted it, when it made so much for his interest I reckon he found it above his Power. I still reckon *Augustin* even as cited by our Dr. page 11. of our mind, and it is no evidence to the contrary, that our Dr. is pleased to say he is foully perverted by us, *Tyconius* joins with us, in taking the word *Angel* collectively, as you have him *Augustin* lib. 3. 30. *de Doct. Christ:* instead of whom the Author of the *Remarks* speaking from his memory set down *Tatian*, whereupon forsooth, our infallible Dr. makes an hideous outcry, and tells the World that *Presbyterian* Writers quote ancient Authors unfaithfully --- and he has frequently found them napping, but as it is usual with Children, he has cry'd himself asleep, for I find him napping and raving too, telling of a Book wrote by Mr. *William Vetch* Minister of *Peebles* now at *Drumfrise*, and arguing, powerfully from it, whereas in plain verity Mr. *William Vetch* did never write any such Book. Now would our Dr. take it well, if I should transcribe his own words, and serve him in his own terms for this Blunder, shall I now say that I'm bound in Charity to believe our worthy Dr. never in all his life saw the Book, he pretends to argue from, but these things I shall in great humility forbear, paying a profound reverence to the Eminence of his Degrees. As for the Argument used *Remarks* p. 6. to prove that the Term *Angel* must be taken collectively, and that the body of Presbyters must be understood by it, the Dr. agrees to it, save in one point *viz:* tho' he frankly acknowledges Presbyters were lights in respect of the People, yet he will by no means allow, that they were lights with respect to the Bishop; If this distinction be but imaginary, it is not in the Drs.

power, as is clear from his own Paper to invalidate the Concluſion, and in my Opinion, the diſtinction is not only Imaginary, but Ridiculous, and Profane, to pretend that *Presbyters*, who have their Commiſſion from *Chriſt*, and preaching the Duties of Chriſtians, as well as the Relational Duties of Church Officers, are not the lights of God, and the Ambaſſadours of *Chriſt*, even to pretended *Prelats* themſelves, is unaccountable with a Witneſs, and what no Ingenuous *Prelatiſt* tho' never ſo much ſtraitned by an argument would have dared to aſſert.

P. 15. I muſt ſhew the Remarker (ſayes he) his groſs miſtake, in alledging that the Author of the *Caſe*, his argument for the ſeveral Degrees among Biſhops proves nothing, if it do not prove the neceſſity of a Pope; here I muſt commend our Doctors Wit for two things. Firſt, becauſe he has not directed the Reader to the 10*th* page of the *Remarks*, where the Argument is ſet off with the cleareſt light and conviction. 2. Becauſe he has not ſo much as attempted to anſwer it, but vainly pretends that if the Author had known ſuch a Citation, and ſuch a Citation in Mr. *Calvin*, he had never ſtumbled upon ſuch a miſtake, but I muſt tell Our Doctor, that the Author of the *Remarks*, is no implicit Faith-Man, and will not be led by mere Authority, but by Scripture and Reaſon. Altho' he muſt commend the Dr. in making uſe of Authority, when both Scripture and Reaſon abſolutely refuſe to contribute for his aſſiſtance, and a long Latine Citation may ſerve to darken the eyes of the Ignorant Reader, when nothing can be given him that is ſenſible in his Mother-Tongue: And yet in the mean time, were thoſe Citations duely canvaſſed and compared with other places of that worthy Author, nothing more than a bare precedency would be found pleaded for, and that for orders ſake, by the Reverend and Judicious Mr. *Calvin*.

Page 17. 18. He falls mighty foul upon the Author of the *Remarks*, he'll have him either groſly Ignorant or Diſingenuous, why? Becauſe he had ſaid that Superintendants were never honoured to be Moderators of the Aſſembly, its plain *Areskin* Superintendant for *Angus*, and *Willock*, Superintendant for the *Merſs*, were choſen Moderators in the Aſſemblies, and that oftner than once; and therefore the Author of the *Remarks* ſhould not have ſaid *never honoured*, but *rarely honoured*, and theſe two did not moderate *Virtute Officii*, but by vertue of the Aſſemblies choiſe, and thus the matter may be mended, and the Argument will run every whit as ſtrong. If the Superintendants were rarely honoured to be Moderators of the Aſſembly, and when they were advanced thereto, it was by choiſe only, then ſure they were not lookt upon by the Church, to be of a Superior Office to the reſt of the Miniſters and Members of the Aſſembly, but they were

rarely

rarely honoured to be Moderators, and never but by choiſe; and conſequently *&c.* The connexion of the Major is clear, for in all Judicatories of the Church, where Prelats or Biſhops are owned and are preſent, they aſſume the precedency as due to their Character, and as the leaſt mark of reſpect that can be put upon them, and the minor is undenyable and frankly acknowledged by Our Author, while he ſaith *Areskin* was choſen Moderator, *Willock* was choſen Moderator, and I do add Mr. *Ferguſon* of *Dumfermling* was choſen Moderator, who was neither Superintendant nor Biſhop, as *Calderwood* obſerves: and I muſt tell Our Author, Mr. *Andrew Ramſay* was choſen Moderator, Mr. *Robert Douglaſs* was choſen Moderator,&c. And therefore ſeeing they never came to that place, but by Choiſe more than others of their Brethren, its plain demonſtration that our Reformers looked not upon them as ſuperior in Office to Presbyters; but I would ask this learned Rabbi a grave Queſtion or two, how came he to overlook the other four Arguments uſed in the *Remarks*, to prove that our Reformers did not look upon Superintendants as Prelats or Biſhops; Was it not told him that they had no conſecration by impoſition of hands, tho' indeed they had ſolemn admiſſion, as a Miniſter hath when he is tranſported from one place to another, and this Office of Admiſſion was performed by mere Presbyters; did not Mr. *Knox* admitt *Spotſwood* Superintendant for *Lothian*, and its ſtrange to hear our Doctor ſay *Spotſwood* was conſecrated Superintendant as page 17, conſecrated without impoſition of hands, conſecrated by a mere Presbyter! It ſeems this Gentleman will frankly allow the Power of Conſecration to a mere Presbyter, when it makes for him, tho' many of his Gang will not allow the power of Ordination to a whole *Presbyterie*. 2*dly* Was it not told him that the Superintendant was countable to, and cenſurable by thoſe over whom they ſuperintended, is this conſiſtent with a *Negative*, or is the want of a *Negative* conſiſtent with Prelacy? where a *Negative* is not pretended to, are not matters managed in that Judicatorie by Officers Acting in parity? Doth there any thing more remain to the Preſident of that Meeting Superintendent or Biſhop, call him as ye will, but a Precedency or Moderatorſhip in the Judicatory? and was not this the caſe of our Superintendents? It had been fully as reaſonable then, for our Doctor to have taken this ſecond Argument wholly under conſideration, and far more Logical than to have fallen upon the concluſion, and called the Author of the *Remarks* Ignorant and Impudent, without ſo much as once touching the Premiſſes from which it was neceſſarly deduced. A 3*d* Argument in the *Caſe*, was others did the work of Superintendants by Commiſſion from the Aſſembly for an year only, even Mere Presbyters, and therefore in the Judgement of the Church the work of the Superintendant was not the work

of an Office, but a work which a Mere Presbyter could perform by ſpecial appointment, and for a limited time. 4. It was told that *Gordon* Biſhop of *Galloway* who reformed from Popery, was received as a Paſtor, but not as a Biſhop, which they would have done if they had judged the Office of a Biſhop of Divine Inſtitution, but all theſe our witty Doctor wiſely paſſeth over, why? perhaps he is a Gentleman of a weak and ſqueamiſh Stomach, and thoſe raw and indigeſted thoughts, as he terms it page 19. had done him harm, proven too ſtrong for his conſtitution, but tho' he had really judged ſo, might he not have given them ſome ſuch ſhort confutation as he gives that learned Book, *Prins* Unbiſhoping of *Timothy* and *Titus* page 12. ſpeaking of it, he calls it *Pitiful and Ridiculous ſtuff as may be*, (this elevated Man works all by authority you find) Learned Confutation indeed, yet ſuch as the Greateſt Sot may eaſily return to the Learnedeſt Clerks! It were eaſie for me, now to tranſcribe our Authors own words page 18. 19. and ſay if our Drs. Brow be not of braſs, and his heart of Oak or Marble, *&c.* But I will pay ſome reverence to his Character, and give ſome eaſe to the Printer, He pretends that the Author of the *Remarks* hath ruined his Reputation, which he has undeſervedly obtain'd, but who can ſtand before Envy, I am of opinion the Author of the *Remarks* hath loſt as little Reputation by his Writings, as the Dr. has gain'd by his. But to pretend that the *Remarks* came to light by the Authority, and with the Approbation of the Commiſſion of the Church, is a baſe falſhood, therefore what ever eſcape may be in that paper, it is chargeable upon the Author only, and reacheth not the Credit of any other. But then our Dr. is bold enough, and gives us another daſh of his preſumptuous and unaccountable Charity, in adviſing the Author of the *Remarks* in ſuch an huffing, hectoring, jeering way, more becoming a Comedian or Mountebank, than a grave and ſerious Dr. in Divinity that ſhould ſpeak the words of truth and ſoberneſs, ſurely I have had occaſion enough given me, to give ſome charitable Advices to our Author, but being perſuaded by what I have ſeen of him, that he is ſome what wiſe in his own eyes, and reckons himſelf as far above me in Wiſdom and Knowledge, as he is indeed in Years, (all which I may eaſily grant) therefore I ſhal not be ſo preſumptuous, and as for the curious Argument propoſed in the extemporary Debate, altho' I reckon it a matter of no great difficulty to expoſe it to a wonder, ſeing I am informed, it is already done to my hand, I ſhal trouble my ſelf no further with the Doctor.

I come at length to conſider that Pamphlet, entituled, *A ſhort Character of the Presbyterian Spirit*, in ſo far as it can be gathered out of their Books; eſpecially out of the Letter from a Gentleman to a Member of

Parlia-

Parliament, the vindication thereof, and *Remarks upon the Case.* And now *I* would have the Judicious to consider, how impossible it is by any Logick to draw an exact and just accompt of *the Presbyterian Spirit*, from the Writings of two or three only concerning *Toleration*: and this is all the foundation on which this curious Architect doth build the Character of *the Presbyterian Spirit.* This Gentleman has fallen upon a notable Knack indeed, and by a little improvement of his art, he may build Castles in the Air, with great facility. But if this way of reasoning, were peculiar to our Author, and other two only among the Prelatists, *I* would judge that sett of Men very fair and equall Disputants, and reckon it an high injury, to characterize the whole Party, by the failures of those three.

In his Preface page 3. he cites, as he pretends, the old Definition of a Presbyterian viz: a Christian, frighted out of his wits, and alledges that it was never more verified, than in the present Writers, especially in these above mentioned, where our Author found this old definition of a Presbyterian, is perhaps a secret, he must not gratifie us with, but for any Man of old, or of late, to pass such a character upon, or give such a definition of a Presbyterian in *Brittain*, or in any other place where Presbyterians are known, serves only to discover the folly, as well as the indisposition, and ill affection of the Broacher. And as for the abovementioned Writers viz: the Authors of the Papers, particularly specified, in his Title-page, in whom, he pretends, that odd definition of a Presbyterian is verified: perhaps he'l find them few in number, and some may tell him they have but one Author: and therefore tho that one Person were indeed frighted out of his wits, as all that know him, very well know the contrary: yet it would be highly unjust, for the distraction of one, to reckon all the Presbyterians frighted out of their Wits. But it seems our Author can prove nothing against Presbyterians, unless yow will allow him to proceed a *particulari ad universale*, which is yet more illogicall, than to proceed *ad decimam nonam consequentiam*, which he without all shadow of reason, charges his Antagonist with. He likewise pretends, that those who write against Toleration, have stuffed their Pamphlets with most notorious untruths, lies and calumnies, and seeing he undertakes to point out those untruths, *&c.* and challenges any Man; especially their Authors to defend them, it will best appear, whether his charge be just, or unjust, after that the particulars, he condescends on, shall be examined. And because I have got such a swatch of his reasoning faculty, in his Preface and Title-page; I shall not debate the merit of the Cause, or wrangle with him about any Argument. I shall only take notice of those particu-

lars, which he will have to be untruths, lies and calumnies: and in this I muſt be reckoned the more fair, ſeing in the laſt lines of his Preface, he confines the work to that *P*rovince. And,

Firſt of all, our Author fals upon the Letter, from a Gentleman to a Member of *P*arliament, in which he pretends, there is a contradiction, for (ſays he) page 4. it is ſaid, all the aim the Toleration can have, muſt be meerly to furniſh a maintenance, for a few Epiſcopall Miniſters, and page 6. it is ſaid, if Toleration be preſſed, the Introduction of *P*relacy is neceſſarily intended and deſigned. Our Author thinks this looks like an other deſign, or aim, and ſo do I too, but is there any contradiction here? No ſurely: for page 4, the Author of the Letter ſpeaks of the Aim, or deſign the *P*arliament might have, in granting a Toleration, and why may not a Judicatorie, ſuch as the *P*arliament have one end onely, in granting a Requeſt, and thoſe that preſs for it, one, or more different from that: ſo that the contradiction is not in the Letter, but in the brain of the Obſerver, and if there ſhould be a thouſand lodged there, *P*resbyterians may be very conſiſtent with themſelves, notwithſtanding of that.

Page 4. He muſters up a heavy Charge againſt *P*resbyterians, as if they had impriſoned, plundered, and rabled Epiſcopall Miniſters. As for rabling, it is ſpoke to already Remarks page 14. as for plundering, a particular Charge ſhould be given in againſt the Guilty, and they ſhould be obliged to make reſtitution. But I very much doubt, if any ſuch particular Charge can be given, and although it could, this generall one might be juſtly reckoned a calumny. As for impriſonments, let the Governours ſee to that, I ſuppoſe it concerns them to chaſtiſe our Author, or oblidge him to be more particular, and were it not that they and his tongue is no ſlander, more than that of any noted ſcold, it is more than probable, they had taken him to task ere now. He alledges alſo, that the ſtipends *P*relaticall Miniſters actually ſerved for, were taken from them, and given to *P*resbyterian *P*reachers. Here we have another Charge advanced againſt the Rulers, and Judges of the Land, and for ought that ever *I* heard, nothing can be more untrue.

*P*age 4. Towards the cloſe, he alledges ſome Scandalous *P*erſons are connived at, others are pecunially diſmiſſed, nay more (ſays he) ſome under ſuſpicion of groſs Scandals, are not once tabled before them, viz: the Judicatories of the Church, and withall adds, ſuſpicion is enough to make further enquiry. *I* ſhall begin with the laſt clauſe of this Libell, and *I* hope, it will not be thought amiſs, that *I* anſwer him backward, and therefor, in the firſt place, *I* am glad, our Author owns ſuſpicion enough to make further enquiry, and *I* hope, if this be his Judgement indeed,

indeed, he will be at ſome pains to convince ſome of his ſtamp, that there was no unjuſtice done them, by the Church, in taking triall of them, upon ſuſpicion, and common fame, and that they are far in the wrong in complaining of it. as indeed they are. And in the next place, *I* muſt tell him, that the Judicatories of the Church cannot be blamed, for thoſe ſuſpected of groſs Scandals that are not ſo much as once tabled before them, tho' the particular *Perſons* who know the grounds of the ſuſpicion, may be highly culpable, for not delating, or informing. *I* know none connived at, and to pretend, that ſcandalous *Perſons* are pecunially diſmiſſed by the Judicatories of this Church, is an abſolute untruth, and ſo contrarie to the knowledge, and Conſcience of all Men that have the leaſt knowledge of our way, that to aſſert it, is to proſtitute the Reputation of the Aſſerter, and let this Gentleman talk, as he will, the body of Debauchees and roaring boyes in the Nation, are Adverſaries to Presbytery, and Friends to *Prelacy*.

Page 5. he will have the Author of the Letter, a Man that regards not the ninth Commandment, becauſe he had ſaid page 10, do not ſome of the *Prelaticall* Miniſters pray for the King, in their Families, yea and in their Meeting-Houſes, even ſince the Queens happy acceſſion to the Crown. But there is no Breach of the ninth Command here, nor of his duty and allegiance to the Queen: for a particular account of this was given in to the late Aſſembly, which they did lay before the Queen, and the Council alſo, and if the Government think fit to enquire into it, Particulars ſhall be eaſily condeſcended on. He pretends, moſt part of the Meeting-Houſe-*Preachers* pray *in Terminis*, for the Queen. I am ſure if they do, they contradict the Orders of their Superiours, and the form concerted, and enjoined by their Prelats, yea tho I do not frequent their Meetings, yet thoſe who do, informe me, that their *Preachers* pray not *in Terminis* for the Queen, but in a moſt jugling manner, for our *Soveraign*. And I undertake to prove, if any man has the impudence to deny it, that this is their unanimous courſe in the ſhire where I live, and now having ſhown his ill-will to the *Letter*, as well as a ſtrong inclination to malign the Author of it, he fals foul upon that Paper, entituled *Tolerations Fence removed*, &c.

Page 5. and 6. He takes notice that in the fourth page of *Tolerations Fence removed*, it is ſaid, there was no Schiſm in the Church, before the ſixty two, and to make this appear an untruth, our Author tels us of the difference between the Remonſtrators, and the publick Reſolutioners. It ſeems he judges it a greater ſhame, for a man to hold his peace, when he has nothing to ſay, than to ſpeak, tho never ſo extravagantly, and

far from the purpoſe. We are treating a *Tolerations Fence removed* of Diviſion in this Church, upon the account of *P*resbyters, and *P*relacy, and it is obſerved there, that there was no diviſion in this Church, according to the Author of the *Caſe*, the Author of the *Defence*, and the *Plain-Dealer*, before the ſixty ſixth upon that Score, and it is there owned, that there was none, before the ſixty two, upon the account of *P*resbytery, and *P*relacy, and may not all this be true, notwithſtanding of that unhappy difference, which fell in amongſt Presbyterians, and which now (bleſſed be the Lord) is entirely removed. *Ibidem* he learnedly argues, that a lineall and uninterrupted Succeſſion of Paſtors, and Prelats canonically ordained from the Apoſtles, ought not to be denied; tho' it could not be proven, no more, than one ought to denie his Antagoniſt to be deſcended from Adam, becauſe he cannot inſtruct his Succeſſion, from Father to Son. But I am of opinion, he ſhall never make the Caſes parallel, till once it appear as impoſſible to find a Church Officer in the Houſe of God not canonically ordained, as it is to find a Man in the World, that is not deſcended of Adam.

*P*age 6. and 7. He takes upon him to deny, that the poor Women ſpoke of T: F: R: page 8. were tied to ſtakes, within Floodmark, till the Sea came up, and drowned them; and yet I have a paper from eye, and ear Witneſſes of that abominable Fact, yea, and tho' the Soldiers, by vertue of an Order, from the Council, made ſome ſham triall, before they did thus execute theſe Women, it may be well ſaid, they died without any due form, or proceſs of Law, and nothing can be more unaccountable, than to grant ſuch a power to Soldiers to kill whomſoever they met, on the road, or found at their work, if they would not give them ſatisfaction, in ſuch matters, as they were allowed to interrogate them upon, and not a few were thus ſummarily executed.

*P*age 7. He would make the World believe, that the *P*resbyterians but chered Major *Johnſtoun*, and that barbarouſly, and treacherouſly. This Gentleman, in his next print, may tell the World, how the *P*resbyterians have butchered the Emperour of the Turks, or Czaar of Muſcovy, if he will: for it is very well known, Major *Johnſtoun* died in his Bed, after that he had lived to a good old age. He was indeed very vexatious to *P*resbyterians, and as I am informed, he was carryed into a Company of them, as if it had been to apprehend and a conventicle: but coming alone, ſome young Men amongſt them laid hold upon him, and made him make ſolemn promiſes to trouble them no more; which yet he did not keep, but lived long enough to be a ſcourge to them; and this is all the butchering, that good Man met with from Presbyterians. He will not allow,

low, that *Gordon* Biſhop of *Galloway* turned Popiſh. However I am ſure, it is generally ſaid, and I my ſelf had it from a Gentleman that ſaw him at *St. Germans*, and in regard that Gentleman is a Man of good intelligence, and of undoubted credit, I made no doubt, nor do I yet of what he ſaid. He tels us of one *Brown*, that perſonated a Presbyterian Miniſter, and kept conventicles who was really a Popiſh Prieſt, and I can tell him, the Devil transforms himſelf into an Angel of Light, and did once appear, in *Samuels* mantle, and what the worſe are the Prophets, or the Angels of Light, for that; He likewiſe tels us page 7, of one who intruded himſelf into a Gentlemans Company, and called himſelf a Presbyterian Miniſter, ſtole the Gentlemans horſe, and was afterwards hanged. Perhaps it had fared the better with him, and the Gentleman too, if he had called himſelf a Prelaticall Miniſter: the Gentleman might have taken more care of his Horſe, and ſo not only have kept him, but alſo preſerved the Poor fellow from the Gallows. *Interpone, tuis, interdum gaudia curis.*

Page 8. He ſays he will give us one who was a Presbyterian, and a Presbyterian Miniſter too, who avowed the Murther of *Charles* the firſt, *viz.* Mr. *Shiels*, alleging that in the *Hind let Looſe*, he approves of it. Whether Mr. *Shiels* was the Author of that Book or not, I believe our worthy Author knows no more than I do, and I do declare, I know it not; I ſhall only ſay, Mr. *Shiels* died, as much beloved, and lamented by all, (whether Presbyterian or Prelaticall) in the Nation that have any ſenſe of Religion, or true concern for the honour and profit of the Countrey, as any I can name; And all thoſe of Mr. *Shiels* his acquaintance, eſpecially ſince he was ordained a Miniſter, can bear him Witneſs, that he had no ſuch poyſonous or wicked principle, as this Man ſpeaks of.

Page 8. he ſeems to be much offended, that the Members of the Aſſembly Anno 1690. ſhould be called Equall, if not Superior to any Aſſembly or Convocation in *Brittain* in our day, for Age, Learning, Prudence, and Gravity. and I am very much indifferent, whether he be offended, or not, for I am ſure, it may be ſaid of them, that cannot be ſaid of any other Aſſembly or Convocation; all of them were *Confeſſors*, and had ſuffered in one Capacity or another for the truth, the Kingly dignity of Chriſt, and priviledges of his houſe. and for that Peeviſh and diſingenuous queſtion, if they were ſuch fine Men, why did they chuſe a depoſed Miniſter Moderator? To this I anſwer, Mr. *Kennedy* Moderator of that Aſſembly was under no Cenſure, when he was choſen Moderator, faleſs under a Sentence of Depoſition; It is true, he was once put under Cenſure, by a party, called the publick Reſolutioners, becauſe, he was oppoſite to them

and protestator, but for no Error or Miscarriage of life, but that Difference amongst Presbyterian Ministers being by the Mercy of God, happly, and many years before that Assemblie removed, all Censures. that had passed on that account Allenarly, and particularly that of Mr. *Kennedies*, were taken off, and declared null. but it is hard to deal with Men that have nothing before their eyes, but how to raise dust, and throw dirt upon those they hate without having any regard to Truth, Conscience, or credit.

Ibidem He will not have it said, that no Reformed Church did ever yet judge any Church not duly constitute, because it wanted Bishops. now if *Tolerations Fence removed* Page 15. be considered; the Judicious Reader will observe, that this as will as other things there said hath no other Scope, than that in the judgement of the Author, no reformed Church did judge it sinfull to hold Communion With a Church that wanteth Prelates, or that that is a just Ground of Separation. Now if this be granted; the scope and Design of what is said page above cited, is obtained, and the Argument there doth conclude, and therefor, I may reckon my self the less concerned, for the Words, or Phrase there used. He will have us to enquire at the reformed Church of *Bohemia*, if they do not judge a Church not duly constitute if it wants Prelats, and I bid him open defiance, to point out any deed of hers condemning hers sister Churches, as not duly constitute upon that account, and I say the same, as to rhe Church of *England*, especially in former times, and to clear this the more fully, let the Courteous Reader consider the 8. 24. 25. and 26. pages of the *Remarks upon the Case*; yea so far was this from being the judgement of the Church of *England*, even in the beginning of Bishop *Laudes* time, who was the first, and chif promoter of it there, that *Doctor Holand* the Kings Professoer of Divinity in *Oxon*, was much offended with Dr. *Laud*, for asserting the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, in a Disputation for his Degrees, he checked him publickly, and told him, he was a *schismatick*, and went about to make a Division between the *English* and other Reformed Churches, and although of late (for it was not the former practice) the *English* Church oblidged the Ministers of the *French* Church, and other Reformed Churches that have not Prelats, to be Reordained, before they can be allowed to serve in the Church of *England*. yet I do again bid open Defiance, to this man, to condescend upon any Canon or Constitution, wherein they deny Men to be Ministers because they Want Episcopall Ordination, tho he has the Confidence to assert it. and As for the Reordination, if this Gentelman had leasure to read, what has been printed. or that head, he would find eminent men of the

Church

Church of *England* declaring that that is uſed, as a forme of Admiſſiion into the Church, and not as if Men had not been Miniſters before.

Page 9. He will have the Author of *T. F. R.* beſides himſelf becauſe he had ſaid page 15. Baptiſme is not refuſed to weak dying Infants that cannot be brought to Church. *If* the Author forſaid had ſaid, no more, it might have looked a little ſtrange, but he enlarges upon the point, and explains himſelf fully, and therefore as it is moſt unfaire to cite half a Sentence, or a general Propoſition without taking notice of other Sentences illuminating, and determining the ſame, ſo I am hopefull, the courteous Reader will judge it neceſſary to conſult the whole paragraph, in the forcited place, where theſe words are uſed before he can paſs any Judgement on them, according to that Maxim *Turpe eſt de lege juaicare, nondum tota lege inſpiecta.*

Ibidem he will not allow that the Presbytrians, ſtand or kneel, in time of Prayer, but whither he allow it, or not, I am very ſure Presbyterians do ſtand, that is to ſay, many of them: it cannot be ſaid of all, at all times, nor can it be ſaid of all the Prelatiſts in the Nation, and the ſame may be ſaid, with reſpect to that of hearing the word uncovered, but enough of this already Page (18) of this paper.

Page 10. he complains, that in the Presbyterian Churches, all the while the Congregation is a conveening, there is no publick edification at all, and that thoſe who come firſt, are but ill employed, asking impertinent queſtions, I'll anſwer our Author, once more backward, perhaps when he was amongſt the number of thoſe that came firſt to the Church, unbecoming Diſcourſe might be entertained between him, and his companions, and yet the honeſt Presbyterians that were without the reach of this Diſturbance might be very well employed, Again I very much doubt, if a ſolid Reaſon can be given, why any of Gods Sacred Ordinances ſhould be diſpenced, before the Congregation be conveened, or if the practice of the Primitive Church can be adduced to countenance that way, or that of any Church, whether Ancient, or modern, but of this. and all he ſayes about it, enough already page (19) &c.

Page 11. he will have his Antagoniſt a Malicious, Impudent, Braſen *faced Impoſture.* a ſhort, and weighty Character indeed; but it may be eaſily born, ſeing it hath nothing for its Foundation, but the Diſcretion, and good affection of its Author; However that the Reader may the better know what reſpect is to be had to the Characters, this juſt, and judicious Gentleman doth coin. and throw at Men, its proper, he conſider the Ground condeſcended on for this. ſpeaking of the Doxologie. Tol: F. R.

Page 19. the Auhor ſays, all the hearers will bear record, that every ſermon was concluded, with the *Doxologie* to the Bleſsed Trinity, and uſually the Prayers too: It may be ſuppoſed I know the Cuſtom, and I do declare that I remember not of any one Sermon that concluded other wiſe: And I am ſure, all the hearers, in ſome places, will bear record, that every Sermon is concluded, with a *Doxology*, and conſequently to the Bleſsed Trinity; for ſeing, none will denie, but we own one God, and three persons, all muſt couclude, in giving glory to God, we give glory to, the Trinity, yea and I dare ſay further, and appeal to the hearers too, that uſually, as the prayers, ſo the ſermons are concluded with an expreſs *Doxologie*, to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, now let it be well conſidered, if at this rate of ſpeakng, our Author doth not rather give a Character of his own Spirit, than of the Spirit of thoſe againſt whom he writes.

Page 12. He will have his Antagoniſt Diſingenuous, becauſe he had ſaid, they muſt have mighty ſqueamiſh Conſciences, that are neceſſitat to ſeparate from a Church that ſo frequently uſes the Doxologie in proſe, merely becauſe, four lines of Humane Compoſure are not ſung in meeter, to the ſame purpoſe, adding this Queſtion, who ſeparates from them, merely upon that account? Truely after the laſt Complement, he may call his Antagoniſt Diſingenuous, or what he will, I am ſure the *Plain-Dealer*, and ſeveral others of his Kidney, who take upon them to Exhibite the Grounds, and Reaſons, why they cannot, in Conſcience join with the Eſtabliſhed Church, give the not uſing the Doxologie, as one; And I am as ſure, all the Difference between their way, and our way of uſing of it, lies meerly in this that they ſing it, at certain times, and we ſay it at certain times; And therefor, their Conſciences muſt be very ſqueamiſh, that ſeparate merely upon that account. And if this be a reall ſcruple of Conſcience, tho' all other things were yeelded to them, they muſt either ſeparate merely upon that account, or elſe hold Communion with us, contrarie to their Conſciences. And if it be no reall ſcruple of Conſcience, why is it reckoned up as one, why have any debate about it? And this Gentleman miſtakes the Figure, if he imagines there is any ground, for a retorſion here, unleſs he can ſhow us, where Presbyterians fixed upon the uſing the Doxologie in meeter, for a ground of their Separation.

As for what he ſpeaks of rabling, and of the buſineſs of *Elgine*, enough has been ſaid already.

Again page 14. our Author cannot be ſatisfied, that Toleration would pave the way to Prelacy, and ſo to Popery. 'Tis hard to ſatisfie ſome Men,

Men, however he may well know, how much Toleration might advance Prelacy, and give Persons of that stamp opportunity, to propagaete their anteRevolution Principles, and all know how far this might go to dispose; for a Popish Successor, and therefore *a primo ad ultimum*, some think, they may rationally conclude, that the granting of a Toleration, may prove an opening of the door to Popery. If this Gentleman be of another Opinion, let him enjoy it, and patiently bear with others that differ from him. How gladly would some Men intrude themselves into good Company, and therefore (says he) to pretend that Prelacy supposes Popery, is to calumniate Her Majesty. No, no Good Sir, we make no such supposition, we know Her Majesties aversion from Popery, as well as that of the Prelats, and Churchmen of England, and Ireland who stand upon a Revolution bottom, and are firm to that Interest, and have given the highest Assurances, that they will not receive a Popish Successor.

Page 15. This Gentleman, as well as his Brother *Plain-Dealer* had done before, in imitation of the Emperour *Domitian*, busies himself in catching flies, nibling at the Name *Tatian*, which was set down in stead of *Tyconius*, and at another Expression, *viz. that the Superintendents were never* honoured, in stead of *were rarely honoured*, to be Moderators of the Generall Assembly; but enough of this before. I suppose, this Gentleman may find it a difficult task, to prove, that it belongs to merr ruling Elders, by Divine Warrant, to judge of the soundness of Doctrine, according to the Presbyterian Principles; and as for his pretending, that our directory for Worship is like an old Almanack, out of date, and print both, observed, neither in one Religions Office, nor another page 16, it seems this Gentlemans *Horn is blown*, as we use to speak, and finding it impossible for him to be worse than he is, or less regarded in what he says, he finds nothing too hard for him to assert? Is the Confession of Faith, the larger, and shorter Catechism, with the Directory, and severall other Particulars annexed, and bound together, out of *Date*, and *Print*, and so much disregarded, as he gives out? Nay sure the Stationers in *Edinburgh*, and every Pedler that has Books to sell, can evidence the contrary of this; yea ye shall hardly find one Family, or Person that is Presbyterian, but has this Book, and many others have it, and bear a great respect to it too.

Page 17. Passing some shamefull falsehoods about Baptism, I cannot but take notice, that he lays it down, as an evident truth, that Presbyterian Ministers excommunicate from the Lords Table, all them of Prelaticall Principles. Enough has been said of this already. But this Gentleman tells us of a Communion at *Ferristown* in *Galloway*, and generally through the

Weſtern Shires, yea ſo particular is he, that he deſires the Remarker to enquire at Mr. *George Andrews*, and Mr. *James Hart* at *Edinburgh*, if ever they uſed to do ſuch a thing? Now I was at the pains to enquire at theſe two worthy Perſons, and they did indeed deny the Charge, and I nothing doubt, but after enquiry, it will be found, as falſe with reſpect to *Ferrytown*, in *Galloway*, and nothing can be more untrue, than to ſay, it is generally done, through the Weſtern Shires. I am ſure, I am well acquainted, with the Miniſters there, and all I have ſpoke to, upon that head, do not only denie, that ever they did it, but that ever they were Witneſs to the doing of it: ſo that this ſtout tongued Gentleman deſerves well of the Party, ſeing he could part with that which is deareſt, if he had it, to ſupport the Intereſt.

Page 18. He takes notice that the Remarker page 33. had ſaid, that the firſt Prelats we had were conſecrated, and ſent from *England*, in the Year 1610. and challenges the Author to defend, and bids him take the aſſiſtence of all the Presbyterians in the Nation. The Defence is eaſy, if no Man can be reckoned a Biſhop, till he be Conſecrated by Biſhops, then ſure we had no Proteſtant Biſhops, untill the Year 1610. becauſe *Spotſwood* and his Fellows were the firſt, that were ſo conſecrated at that time, as doth manifeſtly appear, from all our Records, and particularly, from *Spotſwoods* own Hiſtory. I do not ſay, nor did the Remarker pretend, that *Spotſwood*, and ſome others were not nominated by the King, and commonly called Biſhops of ſuch and ſuch Places, ſome ſhort time before they went up to *London* for conſecration, but that they were not Prelats till then, nor is it denyed, but that *Boyd* at *Glaſgow*, and ſome two or three more had that name of Biſhops, and were commonly called in deriſion *Tulchan Biſhops*, and did enjoy ſome ſmall Allowance of the Revenue to which, by the influtnce of ſome great Men, they were raiſed, that their advancers might enjoy the reſt of the Revenue, by a Tack from them, which in my opinion was the only reaſon of their Elevation, aſwell as of the name, that was commonly given them: And as the grounds of that Politicall Advancement were baſe, and carnall, they ſoon fell to the ground. But had theſe *Tulchan Biſhops* Prelaticall Authority and Juriſdiction? were they conſecrated by *Biſhops*? were they not ſubject to the Presbyteries? and ſynods where they lived? and how they were cenſured, by the Judicatories, is aboundantly known, in the caſe of *Adamſon* at *St. Andrews*. All which being conſidered, and much more might be ſaid, to pretend, that we had Prelats before the 1610. Is but to bewary unacquaintedneſs, with our affairs in thoſe times, or ſome thing elſe, which I am unwilling to name: and as for what follows concerning the ſynod of *Dort*, I have given that account of it, which I know with reſpect to Preſ-

bytery

bytery already, and if any Man will be pleased to consult the 30. *and* 31. pages of the *Remarks upon the Case*, in my Opinion, he shall find a very fair account of the Disposition, and Inclination of the People with respect to Presbytery there, and as for the other particular he takes notice of in the countrey Ministers letter, I can make no other return to it, then is alraedy made *Tolerarion Fence Removed*, page 36. And in my opinion the *retorsion* there with respect to open contempt of all Authority Ecclesiastick, or Civill, is full and home, and such as must not be medled with, it was too hot for the *Plain-Dealers* Fingers, aswell as our Authors, tho' nothing can be reckoned so, for his lips. And thus having ruined the Premisses, the conclusion which I find adjoined to them, rather by a Physical, then a Logicall Connexion, page 20. must be reckoned, by all Judicious Men, a Parcel of particulars, which the Aurhor heartily wishes the world would believe of Presbyterians, and not such as he, or any man is capable to fix upon them by any sort of proof.

SIR.

Your Humble Servant.

POSTCRIPT.

SIR, you may remember, that *Full and Final Answer* page 24. and 25. our *Plain-Dealer* tels us a long storie, of one Mr, *Iohn Ainsley*, and how he was first cheated, and tricked by the Presbyterie of *Iedburgh*, and particularly by Mr *Gabril Semple*, to demit his Ministry att *Oxnam*, wich was a good living, as he terms it, and the more easily to engage him to this, as he pretends, the Presbyterians, aud particularly Mr *Gabriel Semple* promised to admit him to any other place, to which he should get a call. However as is pretended he was still unwilling, in regard he had the love of his People, a numerous family, and the Benefice was considerably great, But knowing (sayes our Author) there was no contending with them, he yelded at last, but so soon as the Presbytry understood, that *Hopkirk* the Heritors, and Parishioners thereof were disposed to give him a Call, rhey immediatly raised amost calumnious libel against him *&c:* But the world may once more know the temper of our Author, and what regard Men should have to his stories, and how well he deserves the name of *Plain-Dealer* which he has assumed to himself. I here subjoin the letter I receved from the Reverend, and worthy Mr *Semple*, a Servant Eminently Honoured of His Master, to gain Souls, and who for his faithfulness to, and Zeal for God. has suffered much from adversaries, and it seems he must not go without a touch from our *Plain-Dealers* tender hand,

Now follows the Letter.

M C. ‘ told me, ye had ſeen a Pamphlet, wherin the presbytry of ‘ *Jedburgh*, was reflected on, and particularly my ſelf, for perſwading Mr ‘ *Ainſly* of *Oxname* to dimit his charge, upon a promiſe to provide him ‘ otherwiſe. I have ſent you here the extract of the Presbytry, that ‘ concerns that affair, which ſhows the Malice of that Reflection, eſpecialy ‘ againſt me. I was then living in *England*, for this was before the ‘ Aſſembly that tranſported me to *Jedburgh* and before ever I ſaw, or knew ‘ ſuch a perſon. That party is at a great loſs, except with thoſe that love ‘ to make lies their refuge. *G. Semple.*

Jedburgh September 16th 1703.

Here follows the Extract of the Presbytry: *Denholme 16th July 1690.*

‘ The which day, there was a Letter preſented to this meeting, ‘ directed from Mr. *John Ainſly*, Miniſter at *Oxnam*, to the ‘ Right Reverend the Moderator, and brethren of the Pres- ‘ bytery Aſſembled at *Denholme*, of date 14. *July* 1690, at *Oxnam*, ‘ bearing that, he haveing met with many Diſcouragements in *Oxname* ‘ touching his Miniſtry, the people having wholly deſerted him and ‘ refuſed the Ordinances from him, and therefor ſeeing he was thereby ‘ rendered uncapable to do Servce to God In that place, he had of a ‘ time Thoughts of dimiting his Charge. But finding no Church Judicatorie ‘ ſettled untill now, he therfore embraced the firſt opertuniry, and does ‘ therefor by theſe Right Reverend, lay down his charge in the Pariſh of ‘ *Oxnam* to them, whereupon the Commiſſiouners from the Pariſh of *Oxname* ‘ *viz. Simon Eliot* of *Swinyde Adam Tait* in *Cezertown &c.* took inſtruments ‘ of his dimiſſion in the ſaid Pariſh *Oxname* and craved, that the Kirkt ‘ might be declared vacant, which the Presbytery referred to the Synod, ‘ Extracted forth of the Joint Presbyteries by. *Jo. Richie.* Cls. Pl.

Things ſpeak ſo powerfully here, that I need ſay nothing at all, only I ſuppoſe it is the Intreſt alwell, as the Duty of all ſerious, and ſober perſons of the Prelarick Perſwaſion to take this Gentelman to task, for his fowll Miſrepreſentations, and Particularly, for this groſs, and unaccountable one. Leaſt ſome, with the *Trojans* ſay.

Accipe nunc Danaum *Inſidias, & Crimine ab uno Diſce omnes*

FINIS.